# USSSA CASE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Proceedings, Outcome & Updated Oklahoma Research Context

Wegman & Horrom v. United States Specialty Sports Association, Inc., et al.
Middle District of Florida - Orlando Division | Case No. 6:23-cv-01637-RBD-RMN

**Updated September 2026. Incorporates the current Hidden Valley - Integrity of the Game Oklahoma USSSA totals and separates pleading allegations, judicial rulings, settlement outcome, and independent Oklahoma research.**

| Updated Oklahoma metric | Total |
| --- | --- |
| Calculated Team Entry Fees | $36,516,991 |
| Teams | 166,964 |
| Minimum Games | 430,060 |
| Minimum Officials | 786,896 |

## 1. Executive Finding

The federal litigation is significant because former high-ranking USSSA personnel placed extensive allegations concerning governance, financial practices, whistleblower retaliation, and alleged racketeering predicates into a public federal-court record. The April 17, 2024 Second Amended Complaint asserted thirteen counts, including civil RICO, RICO conspiracy, federal whistleblower-retaliation theories, contract claims, defamation, and Florida whistleblower claims.

The case did **not** end with a trial verdict establishing the complaint's broad allegations. The RICO theory and other claims were dismissed before settlement, and the remaining litigation was resolved by mutual settlement in April 2025. Public reporting describes the settlement terms as confidential.

> **Core distinction: A complaint is an allegation document. A dismissal may resolve legal sufficiency without adjudicating every disputed historical fact. A confidential settlement is a negotiated resolution, not a jury verdict. The Oklahoma dataset does not convert Florida allegations into findings against Oklahoma directors, facilities, municipalities, or USSSA.**

## 2. Federal Case - Allegations & Architecture

The Second Amended Complaint named USSSA and several current or former leaders and invoked federal jurisdiction under civil RICO, the Anti-Money Laundering Act whistleblower provision, and the Taxpayer First Act, together with Florida-law claims.

### Alleged predicate-act structure

The pleading scheduled alleged bank, mail and wire fraud; money laundering and illegal gambling; witness tampering; and witness retaliation. It also alleged improper or undocumented loans, personal-use expenditures, diversion of event revenues, Form 990 reporting issues, insider-benefit arrangements, and retaliation. These are allegations unless separately established by an authoritative finding.

### State/local representative structure

The pleading described state and local representatives as typically independent contractors and stated that non-national event coordinators may earn revenues associated with registration/entry fees, gate fees and concessions. This is relevant to Oklahoma because it supports analyzing the national organization, state administration, independent directors, facilities, and event operations as distinct layers.

## 3. Proceedings & Outcome

| Stage | Proceeding | Significance |
|---|---|---|
| Aug. 2023 | Federal litigation initiated. | Created a public federal record involving former senior USSSA personnel. |
| Apr. 17, 2024 | Second Amended Complaint - Dkt. 155. | Expanded allegations and detailed the RICO/predicate-act theory. |
| Late 2024 | RICO theory and other claims dismissed before settlement. | Substantially narrowed the case; dismissal is distinct from a trial finding on every factual assertion. |
| Apr. 21, 2025 | Parties reported the litigation resolved in full. | Public record reflects mutual resolution. |
| 2025 | Settlement described as confidential. | No public jury verdict adjudicated the full allegation set. |

**Proper description: A federal civil case containing serious allegations, followed by substantial pre-settlement narrowing/dismissal and a later confidential mutual settlement. It should not be described as a criminal prosecution, government RICO enforcement action, or trial judgment finding defendants liable for the entire allegation set.**

## 4. Updated Oklahoma Research - 2001-2026

The current Hidden Valley dataset identifies **$36,516,991 in calculated team entry fees**: **$20,948,047 baseball** and **$15,568,944 softball**, across **166,964 teams**, **430,060 minimum games**, **786,896 minimum required officials**, and **20,305 divisions of play**.

| Measure | Updated total |
|---|---|
| Calculated Team Entry Fees | $36,516,991 |
| Baseball | $20,948,047 |
| Softball | $15,568,944 |
| Teams | 166,964 |
| Minimum Games | 430,060 |
| Minimum Officials | 786,896 |
| Divisions | 20,305 |
| Facilities | 422 |
| Directors | 242 |
| Municipalities | 236 |
| Counties | 88 |
| League Team Entry Fees | $395,322 |
| League Teams | 9,531 |

## 5. Concentration & Trend Findings

### Municipalities

**Tulsa $4,744,527; Bixby $3,405,984; Moore $2,349,804; Choctaw $1,788,596; Broken Arrow $1,781,183; Oklahoma City $1,716,250; Jenks $1,522,344; Citizen Potawatomi Nation $1,432,005; Chickasha $1,429,808.**

### Facilities

**Bentley Sports Complex $3,149,606; Savage Park $2,731,173; Buck Thomas Park $2,282,068; Bouse Sports Complex $1,779,547; Indian Springs Sports Complex $1,713,537; Jenks Youth Baseball Complex $1,489,318; FireLake Ballfields $1,432,005; Chickasha Sports Complex $1,370,408.**

### Director-associated activity

The updated report displays the three largest calculated director-associated team-entry-fee profiles at approximately **$6.85M, $6.18M, and $4.52M**. These amounts describe event activity associated with director records; they are **not** proof of personal income, profit, tax liability, or disposition of funds.

### Recent seasons

Calculated team-entry-fee activity is **$2,562,323 in 2026**, **$2,411,275 in 2025**, **$2,605,431 in 2024**, **$2,378,930 in 2023**, **$2,079,669 in 2022**, and **$2,252,063 in 2021**.

**Research significance: The Oklahoma dataset does not prove the Florida allegations occurred in Oklahoma. It does show why the national-to-state-to-director-to-facility structure warrants transparent, record-based study.**

## 6. Facility Methodology - Direct vs. Associated Activity

The updated facility report separates stand-alone primary-facility activity from multi-facility/satellite-event associations and then provides a combined footprint.

| View | Meaning |
|---|---|
| Pages 1-2 - Primary Facility | Direct records listing the selected facility by itself. |
| Page 3 - Multi-Facility | Associated events in which the facility appears with additional locations. |
| Page 4 - Combined Footprint | Direct plus associated activity; association, not proof of allocation. |

**Association is not allocation. A multi-facility event may establish that locations were associated with the same tournament without establishing how teams, games, officials, entry fees, gate receipts or concessions were divided.**

## 7. What the Financial Numbers Mean

Team Entry Fees are a **calculated measure of documented economic activity**: participating teams multiplied by the publicly displayed entry fee for the applicable event or division.

| The dataset can support | The dataset alone does not establish |
|---|---|
| Scale of documented event activity | Actual payment collection |
| Participation and posted-price relationships | Gross receipts or net profit |
| Patterns by year, sport, director, facility and municipality | Director compensation or personal income |
| Minimum games and officials | Taxable income or tax liability |
| Facility/event associations | Gate or concession revenue actually received |
| Questions for records-based verification | Ownership, concealment, diversion or unlawful use of funds |

The statewide totals therefore function as an investigative map identifying where financial records, facility agreements, bank/merchant records, tax documents, invoices, municipal reports and other authoritative sources could confirm or refute specific hypotheses.

## 8. Florida Case vs. Oklahoma Dataset - Research Crosswalk

| Florida pleading theme | Oklahoma verification question |
|---|---|
| Independent state/local representatives | How are Oklahoma directors appointed, paid, documented and supervised? |
| Registration, gate and concession revenue | What event revenue streams exist and who receives them? |
| Financial reporting / allocation allegations | Do facility, nonprofit, director and governmental records reconcile with public event activity? |
| Whistleblower-retaliation allegations | What complaint and anti-retaliation mechanisms exist? |
| Regional/state organizational leverage | How do national, state, director and facility relationships operate? |
| Tax-reporting allegations | Which entities have reporting obligations and what do authoritative records show? |

**This crosswalk is a research framework, not an accusation.** Similarity in structure or payment pathways does not establish the same conduct, intent, or legal violation.

## 9. Public-Asset & Reform Significance

The strongest Oklahoma policy question is broader than whether any single operator committed misconduct: **What transparency should be required when privately controlled tournament commerce relies on taxpayer-owned or taxpayer-supported athletic infrastructure?**

The current research architecture identifies 422 facilities, 236 municipalities, 88 counties and 242 directors. This creates a basis for systematic review of facility agreements, utilities, operator selection, insurance, reporting, concessions, gate collections, contractor classification, 1099 practices, public access and community benefit.

### Current model vs. reform model

The updated research graphic contrasts a current-model risk scenario - fragmented control, private or opaque payment paths, limited public reporting and potential conflicts - with a proposed reform model built around written agreements, organizational bank accounts, standardized accounting, 1099 reporting, documented cash, independent review, public reporting, and demonstrable facility/community benefit.

**Policy objective: Focus on prospective transparency and accountability standards rather than presuming criminality from scale alone. The central question is how to document who collects funds, who bears public costs, how contractors are compensated, and how taxpayer-supported facilities benefit youth and communities.**

## 10. Updated Landing-Page Language

**Proceedings & Outcome.** The federal case *Wegman & Horrom v. United States Specialty Sports Association, Inc., et al.* placed extensive RICO, whistleblower, governance and financial allegations into the public record. The federal RICO theory and other claims were dismissed before settlement, and the remaining litigation was resolved through a confidential mutual settlement reported in April 2025. The litigation therefore did not produce a trial verdict establishing the full allegation set. The case remains important to this research as a documented governance and whistleblower case study and as a framework for identifying questions that can be independently tested against Oklahoma records.

### Research conclusion

The updated Oklahoma data substantially strengthens the **scale** component of the research while the revised methodology strengthens its **precision**. The responsible next step is transaction-level verification: compare public event activity with contracts, facility records, payment records, nonprofit filings, tax information available to authorized agencies, and other primary evidence.

**Research principle: Follow the records. Preserve the distinction between documented fact, calculated activity, allegation, inference, legal ruling, settlement, and conclusions requiring independent verification.**