

No. 20-

---

---

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**

---

NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION,  
*Petitioner,*

*v.*

SHAWNE ALSTON, *et al.*,  
*Respondents.*

---

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI  
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF  
APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

---

**PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI**

---

JEFFREY A. MISHKIN  
KAREN HOFFMAN LENT  
SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE,  
MEAGHER & FLOM LLP  
4 Times Square  
New York, N.Y. 10036

BETH A. WILKINSON  
WILKINSON WALSH LLP  
2001 M St. N.W., 10th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20036

SETH P. WAXMAN  
*Counsel of Record*  
LEON B. GREENFIELD  
DANIEL S. VOLCHOK  
DAVID M. LEHN  
DEREK A. WOODMAN  
SPENCER L. TODD  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING  
HALE AND DORR LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Ave. N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20006  
(202) 663-6000  
seth.waxman@wilmerhale.com

---

---

## **QUESTION PRESENTED**

Whether the Ninth Circuit erroneously held, in conflict with decisions of other circuits and general antitrust principles, that the National Collegiate Athletic Association eligibility rules regarding compensation of student-athletes violate federal antitrust law.

(i)

## **PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS**

Petitioner, defendant-appellant below, is the National Collegiate Athletic Association.

Respondents, plaintiffs-appellees below, are Shawne Alston; Don Banks; Duane Bennett; John Bohannon; Barry Brunetti; India Chaney; Chris Davenport; Dax Dellenbach; Sharrif Floyd; Kendall Gregory-McGhee; Justine Hartman; Nigel Hayes; Ashley Holliday; Darenta Jamerall Stephens; Alec James; Afure Jemerigbe; Martin Jenkins; Kenyata Johnson; Nicholas Kindler; Alex Lauricella; Johnathan Moore; Kevin Perry; Anfornee Stewart; Chris Stone; Kyle Theret; Michelle Thomas; Kendall Timmons; and William Tyndall.

Other defendants-appellants below were the American Athletic Conference; the Atlantic Coast Conference; The Big Ten Conference, Inc.; The Big 12 Conference, Inc.; Conference USA; the Mid-American Conference; the Mountain West Conference; the Pac-12 Conference; the Southeastern Conference; the Sun Belt Conference; and the Western Athletic Conference.

## **CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The National Collegiate Athletic Association is an unincorporated, non-profit membership association composed of over 1,200 member schools and conferences. It has no corporate parent, and no publicly held corporation owns 10 percent or more of its stock.

## **RELATED PROCEEDINGS**

United States District Court (N.D. Cal.):

A. *House et al. v. NCAA et al.*, No. 4:20-cv-3919.

B. *Jenkins et al. v. National Collegiate Athletic Association et al.*, No. 4:14-cv-2758 (dismissed).

(ii)

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....	i
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS.....	ii
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.....	ii
RELATED PROCEEDINGS.....	ii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	v
OPINIONS BELOW .....	1
JURISDICTION .....	2
STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED .....	2
INTRODUCTION .....	2
STATEMENT .....	6
A. The NCAA And Amateurism In College Sports.....	6
1. The NCAA administers intercollegiate athletics as an integral component of higher education .....	6
2. <i>Board of Regents</i> .....	9
3. <i>O'Bannon</i> .....	10
B. Procedural History .....	12
1. District Court .....	12
2. Ninth Circuit .....	14
REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION.....	16
I. THE NINTH CIRCUIT'S DECISION IMPLICATES AN ESTABLISHED AND ACKNOWLEDGED CIRCUIT CONFLICT .....	16

**TABLE OF CONTENTS—Continued**

	Page
A. Consistent With This Court’s Broader Joint-Venture Law, <i>Board Of Regents</i> Recognized That NCAA Amateurism Rules Are Presumptively Procompetitive And That The NCAA Needs Leeway To Adopt Such Rules .....	17
B. Most Circuits Have Understood <i>Board Of Regents</i> And <i>American Needle</i> To Require That NCAA Amateurism Rules Be Upheld Without Fact-Intensive Rule-Of-Reason Analysis .....	19
C. The Ninth Circuit Takes A Starkly Different Approach.....	22
II. THE DECISION BELOW IS WRONG.....	24
III. THE QUESTION PRESENTED IS RECURRING AND IMPORTANT .....	29
CONCLUSION .....	33
APPENDIX A: Opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, dated May 18, 2020 .....	1a
APPENDIX B: Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, March 8, 2019 .....	65a
APPENDIX C: Permanent Junction of the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, March 8, 2019.....	167a

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.