SPORTS BETTING IN INDIANA: THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION AFTER MURPHY v. NCAA

PLACIDO A. ZAMBRANO

INTRODUCTION

Americans wagered $158 million legally approximately $4.76 billion on Super Bowl LII at the Nevada sportsbooks. The American Gaming Commission projected that across the United States, individuals wagered $4.76 billion on Super Bowl LII and placed 97 percent of those total bets illegally. This estimate equated to more than $4.6 billion in illegal sports betting. Nationwide, Americans illegally bet between $150 billion and $450 billion on sports every year. When the NBA Finals, the NFL Super Bowl, or the MLB World Series are underway, Indiana residents cannot legally place their bets on the game because in Indiana, placing a bet with a sports bookmaker is punishable as a level six felony. However, Hoosiers across the state still rush to call their illegal sports bookmakers and place their bets on upcoming sporting events.

Betting illegally on sports might soon be a thing of the past for Hoosiers because of the recent Supreme Court decision in Murphy v. NCAA. Indiana residents are excited by the possibility of legal sports betting because now they can place their bets “away from the shadows of secrecy and stigmatization.” Indiana casinos share that excitement; as Matt Bell, the President of the Indiana Casino Association, stated, “the [Murphy] decision creates an opportunity for...”
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Indiana to create a regulated and transparent market that allows Hoosiers to legally participate in sports wagering. Amidst the statewide enthusiasm, the Indiana legislature will decide the future of sports betting in the state.

The recent Supreme Court decision in *Murphy* has some Indiana state legislators celebrating at the prospect of finally being able to regulate the unfamiliar revenue-raising opportunity of sports betting. Experts estimate that within five years, sports betting in Indiana is likely to total bets of $256 million a year, which translates to 2,281 direct and indirect new jobs and $38 million in new state tax revenue annually. As Indiana Senator Ron Alting stated, “We’re taking something that people are doing illegally today[,] and we are capitalizing on it by making it legal and regulating it[.]” In Indiana, legislators in both the House of Representatives and the Senate introduced sports betting bills in the 2018 legislative session before the *Murphy* decision. However, the 2018 Indiana legislative session closed with no vote on either bill. Indiana legislators estimated that a sports betting bill would be effective no earlier than July 1, 2019. Both Indiana Representative Alan Morrison and Senator Jon Ford stated that they would re-introduce the sports betting bill again in the 2019 legislative session. Currently, legislators are weighing the options for sports betting
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including where the betting will occur, how to tax and spend the revenue from the newly legal activity, and what sports are appropriate for betting.\textsuperscript{18}

This Note argues that Indiana legislators need to pass legislation to legalize sports betting to take advantage of its enormous revenue-raising opportunity. Part I of this Note synopses the history of sports betting, the history of betting in Indiana, and the difference between fantasy sports and sports betting. Part II outlines the Murphy decision and the importance of the Tenth Amendment. Part III of this Note discusses the provisions that Indiana legislators should include in their 2019 Sports Betting Bill (the “Bill”). First, the Bill should include a provision that allows sports betting only at Indiana’s fourteen licensed casinos, and four licensed betting facilities. Second, the Bill should include a provision that allows for online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications. Third, the Bill should include a provision that allows individuals to bet on any professional sports teams, but only collegiate teams that are not from Indiana. Fourth, the Bill should include a provision that allows the Indiana Gaming Commission (“IGC”) to regulate sports betting. Part IV of this Note discusses the taxation framework that Indiana legislators should include in the Bill. First, Indiana needs to charge a $100,000 licensing fee for any of the seventeen betting facilities that want to hold sports betting. Second, Indiana needs to tax the casinos and betting operators 9.75 percent of its sports betting yearly gross revenue from sports betting. Third, Indiana’s taxation framework should not pay an integrity fee from its annual sports betting revenue to the professional leagues. Finally, Part V of this Note explores the implementation considerations that Indiana legislators need to consider before legalizing sports betting.

I. THE HISTORY OF SPORTS BETTING

A. Why Is Sports Betting Illegal?

To understand the importance of the Murphy decision legalizing sports betting, it is important to know why sports betting was illegal for so long. In the 1800s, corruption led the federal government to ban nearly all forms of legal betting.\textsuperscript{19} However, betting on horse racing remained legal until the early 1900s when many Americans developed a strong distaste for activities associated with the super-rich, including horse racing.\textsuperscript{20} The stigma against sports betting reached its peak in 1919 when eight members of the heavily favored Chicago White Sox allegedly intentionally lost the World Series against the Cincinnati Reds in exchange for a bribe of about $10,000 apiece, which is the equivalent of...
approximately $150,000 in 2019. The Great Depression made the legislature change its perspective on betting. To raise funds for the Hoover Dam Project, Nevada legalized gambling. The legalization of gambling in Nevada was a success, which led a group of sports bookmakers to request the state of Nevada to let it open sportsbooks in the state.

The group of bookmakers succeeded, and in 1949, Nevada legalized sports betting. Moreover, the state gave the bookmakers permission and legal authority to accept bets on all professional sports (NFL, NHL, MLB, and the NBA), in addition to horse racing. However, in the 1960s outside of Nevada, organized crime continued to dominate the gambling and sports betting markets. In the 1960s and 1970s, Congress passed a series of laws trying to restrict illegal sports betting. But, illegal sports betting continued and increased in the 1970s and 1980s when the United States Department of Justice decided to de-prioritize the enforcement of anti-gambling laws. Moreover, in 1976, the Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling (the “Commission”) stated that “gambling is inevitable,” and enforcing laws against it was “impossible.” Ultimately, the existing sports betting laws remained on the books, even if the government rarely enforced them.

In the late 1980s, suspicious game-fixing scandals and the MLB’s indefinite ban for then Reds Team Manager Pete Rose for betting on MLB games, created momentum for additional federal legislation aimed at eliminating or at least stopping the spread of sports betting. The federal government eventually passed
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The Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act of 1992 ("PASPA"). The PASPA was a federal law banning sports betting, despite most states already prohibiting it. The PASPA required states to tell Congress within a year whether they wanted to have sports betting within their borders. Since only four states applied for the PASPA’s sports betting authorization, sports betting became illegal in most of the United States.

B. Indiana Through the Years

The path to legal betting in Indiana began in 1988 when voters approved a lottery referendum by 62 percent. In 1989, the Indiana General Assembly ratified the Lottery Act, and the Hoosier Lottery offered its first legal lottery tickets for sale in October of 1989. Four years later, the Indiana General Assembly passed the Indiana Riverboat Gaming Act, which allowed for the construction of ten riverboat casinos. In 1995, the first of these ten riverboat casinos opened in Evansville, with excitement all around the city as the Dress Plaza horns were blasting, fire trucks horns on shore were blasting, and people lined the bank and peered through the windows of the city’s high-rise buildings to get a glimpse of the new gaming destination. In 2004, the Indiana General Assembly passed legislation for the construction of the casino in French Lick, Indiana. In 2007, the General Assembly passed legislation allowing 2,000 slot machines at each of the two horse racing tracks, which brought casino-type gaming to the cities of Shelbyville and Anderson in central Indiana. The term for the combined racing and casino properties is “racinos.” In 2017, Caesars
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Entertainment bought the racinos for $1.7 billion and planned to invest $50 million in various property improvements and IT upgrades at the properties.\(^{44}\) This acquisition of the racinos has increased the interest in Indiana as a major betting market, as Mark Frissora, president and CEO of Caesars Entertainment, stated: “Indiana will be our largest market after this acquisition, besides Nevada.”\(^{45}\) Finally, in 2018, the Four Winds Casino opened in South Bend as the first casino in the state of Indiana owned and operated by a Native American tribe.\(^{46}\) In just a short twenty-five years, Hoosier bettors today can find games of chance at land-based, tribal and riverboat casinos, and at horse racing tracks with slot machines.\(^{47}\)

As discussed \textit{infra}, after the \textit{Murphy} decision, the states are now free to choose whether to legalize sports betting.\(^{48}\) Anticipating the decision, legislators in both the House of Representatives and the Senate introduced sports betting bills in the 2018 legislative session.\(^{49}\) The 2018 House of Representatives Bill 1325, introduced by Representative Alan Morrison, would have required a 9.25 percent tax on sports betting-related revenue and would allocate a 1 percent integrity fee to the sports leagues.\(^{50}\) Representative Morrison’s 2018 bill gained nationwide focus as Indiana became the first state to work with the professional sports leagues publicly.\(^{51}\) When asked about working with the professional sports leagues, Representative Morrison said working with the professional league would help with the integrity aspect of sports betting.\(^{52}\) Indiana State Senator Jon Ford also has introduced a bill aimed at legalizing sports betting, but Ford’s bill did not include an integrity fee for the leagues.\(^{53}\) Ultimately, the 2018 Indiana legislative session closed with no vote on either sports betting bill.\(^{54}\)

Following the 2018 Indiana legislative session, legislators decided to conduct a study of the implications of sports betting in Indiana.\(^{55}\) In August 2018, the General Assembly agreed to a two-year, $74,999 contract with Eilers & Krejcik
to conduct a study for sports betting in Indiana. In October 2018, after a four-hour session of a legislative study committee, lawmakers voted 9-0 to move forward with bringing legal sports betting to Indiana. During the session, the 142-page report, prepared by Eilers & Krejcik Gaming, recommended that the state should enact legal sports betting during the 2019 legislative session. After the decision to move forward with sports betting, committee chair State Representative Ben Smaltz warned that there are still “many perils down the pathway before it becomes law.” As legislators discover more information on sports betting, it is clear that the 2019 Indiana General Assembly’s session will involve casino and gaming issues more than other sessions in recent years, including proposed bills for legal sports betting.

C. Sports Betting vs. Fantasy Sports

Sports betting and fantasy sports are both based on real-life results of sporting events. However, daily fantasy sports are legal in the United States, while sports betting remained illegal until the Murphy decision. In fantasy sports, individuals choose real players in a draft or an online selection process to assemble a fantasy team. Then, the selected players’ real-game statistics are compiled and compared to see whose fantasy team has done the best. In contrast, sports betting is the activity of predicting sports results and placing a wager on the outcome. Fantasy sports were ruled legal in a series of court decisions, which held that fantasy sports are legal because they are a game of skill, as opposed to sports betting which is a game of chance. Additionally, the Unlawful Internet
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Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 excludes fantasy sports as an unlawful internet gambling activity as long as people are not betting on the outcome of a single game or the performance of a single player. This Note will focus on sports betting and not fantasy sports because Indiana already has legislation that allows for daily fantasy sports companies to operate, effective July 1, 2016.

II. LEGALIZED SPORTS BETTING LEFT TO THE STATES

A. Murphy v. NCAA

In May 2018, the Supreme Court of the United States struck down the provision of the PASPA prohibiting state authorization of sports gambling schemes. In 1992, Congress passed the PASPA, to prohibit state-sanctioned sports gambling. The PASPA’s anti-authorization provision said states could not “sponsor, operate, advertise, promote, license, or authorize by law or compact” sports gambling. The PASPA made exemptions for gambling in four states: Nevada, Delaware, Oregon, and Montana, which already had established sports betting regulations in place. New Jersey attempted to apply for the exemption but failed to act in 1991 before this exemption window closed. The New Jersey Legislature enacted the Sports Wagering Act (“2012 Act”), allowing sports wagering at New Jersey casinos and racetracks to help the casino industries in a faltering economy. However, professional sports leagues and the NCAA immediately challenged the 2012 Act.

In August 2012, the National Basketball Association (“NBA”), National Football League (“NFL”), National Hockey League (“NHL”), Major League Baseball (“MLB”), and National Collegiate Athletic Association (“NCAA”) sued under the PASPA to strike down the New Jersey law. The district court and the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, in a split decision, found that the PASPA did not...
violates the anti-commandeering rule of the Tenth Amendment.\textsuperscript{77} The decisions from the lower courts prohibited the state from enforcing the 2012 Act.\textsuperscript{78} After the Supreme Court denied certiorari, the New Jersey legislature passed the Sports Wagering Act of 2014 ("2014 Act").\textsuperscript{79} The 2014 Act repealed some provisions of the 2012 Act because it allowed casinos and racetracks to provide sports betting without the state’s involvement in the licensing or regulating of sports betting, unlike the 2012 Act, which involved the state in licensing and regulating sports betting.\textsuperscript{80} In November 2014, the five leagues sued New Jersey again.\textsuperscript{81}

The district court and Third Circuit Court of Appeals found that the 2014 Act violated the PASPA and that the anti-authorization provision did not violate the Tenth Amendment because it did “not command states to take affirmative actions.”\textsuperscript{82} The Supreme Court granted certiorari to decide the important Tenth Amendment issue raised in the lower courts.\textsuperscript{83} The issue raised on certiorari by the petitioner, New Jersey, was whether “a federal statute that prohibits modification or repeal of state-law prohibitions on private conduct impermissibly commandeers the regulatory power of States.”\textsuperscript{84} New Jersey argued that the PASPA’s anti-authorization provision violates the anti-commandeering rule of the Tenth Amendment and is thus unconstitutional.\textsuperscript{85} The United States and the NCAA defended the PASPA’s anti-authorization provision by arguing that the provision is a valid preemption of state law through the Supremacy Clause.\textsuperscript{86} Ultimately, the Court held that the PASPA’s provision prohibiting state authorization of sports gambling schemes violated the anti-commandeering rule of the Tenth Amendment.\textsuperscript{87} The Court reasoned that the provision “unequivocally dictates what a state legislature may and may not do.”\textsuperscript{88} Therefore, the states are now free to choose whether to legalize sports betting.\textsuperscript{89}

\textbf{B. Tenth Amendment Anti-Commandeering Doctrine}

Following the \textit{Murphy} decision, the Supreme Court showed the importance
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of the Tenth Amendment anti-commandeering doctrine.\textsuperscript{90} The Tenth Amendment
states: “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor
prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the
people.”\textsuperscript{91} “The Constitution confers on Congress not plenary legislative power,”
but instead only certain enumerated powers, and the states have all other
legislative powers.\textsuperscript{92} Since its decision in \textit{New York v. United States}, the Supreme
Court has declared laws unconstitutional for violating the Tenth Amendment
when the federal government compelled or commandeered states to enforce
federal statutes.\textsuperscript{93} The anti-commandeering doctrine represents the recognition of
limits to the enumerated powers of congressional authority.\textsuperscript{94}

Adherence to the anti-commandeering doctrine is important. First, the rule
serves as “one of the Constitution’s structural protections of liberty.”\textsuperscript{95} The anti-
commandeering doctrine protection of liberty provides a healthy balance of
power between the states and the federal government and reduces the risk of
tyranny.\textsuperscript{96} “Second, the anticommandeering rule promotes political
accountability.”\textsuperscript{97} For example, if Congress imposes regulations, then voters
know who to credit or blame for the regulations.\textsuperscript{98} However, if a state imposes
regulations only because it has been forced to do so by Congress, then voters do
not know who to credit or blame for the regulations.\textsuperscript{99} Third, the anti-
commandeering principle “prevents Congress from shifting the costs of regulation
to the States.”\textsuperscript{100} For example, if Congress enacts a regulation, it must appropriate
the funds needed to administer the program by weighing the expected benefits of
the program against its costs.\textsuperscript{101} However, if Congress can compel the States to
enact and enforce its program, Congress does not need to weigh the expected
benefits of the program against its costs.\textsuperscript{102} As a result of the anticommandeering
doctrine, states like Indiana can choose whether or not to legalize sports betting.
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III. INDIANA SPORTS BETTING LEGISLATION

Currently, Indiana legislators are deciding the implications of legalizing sports betting. The biggest questions for legislators are where the betting will occur, whether to allow online betting, what sports are appropriate for betting, and who will be in charge of regulating sports betting. There are currently five states that have legalized sports betting including Nevada, Delaware, New Jersey, Mississippi, and West Virginia. By looking at what other states have done, Indiana legislators will have guidance on which provisions to include their Bill.

A. Where Is Sports Betting Allowed?

The first provision that the Bill should include is to allow sports betting only at Indiana’s fourteen licensed casinos and four licensed betting facilities. As discussed infra, once the IGC grants these facilities their sports betting license, they will be able to offer a sportsbook. Allowing only licensed casinos or licensed betting facilities to conduct sports betting is the best approach for Indiana because this approach will provide a transparent sports betting market for the Hoosier state. Moreover, Indiana should only allow sports betting at Indiana’s fourteen licensed casinos and four licensed betting facilities because every state that has legalized sports betting follows this approach.

In Indiana, casinos are ready to offer sports betting, but they need the legislature to allow them to do so. Casino Association of Indiana President and CEO Matt Bell stated that “the [Murphy v. NCAA] decision creates an opportunity for Indiana to create a regulated and transparent market that allows Hoosiers to legally participate in sports wagering.” Moreover, Troy Stremming, spokesman
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for Pinnacle Entertainment stated that “[c]asinos would provide sports betting with integrity guaranteed and in a more transparent manner.”\footnote{111} Hoosiers who place bets can be prosecuted for a level six felony.\footnote{112} In a recent survey, 52 percent of the Indiana residents that participated in the survey stated that they illegally place at least one sports bet per week.\footnote{113} This provision will allow Indiana legislators to take sports betting out of the hands of illegal sportsbooks and make the sports betting market open and transparent.\footnote{114}

Indiana need only allow licensed casinos or licensed betting facilities to conduct sports betting because every state that has legalized sports betting follows this approach.\footnote{115} Nevada allows sports betting only at licensed sportsbooks, which nearly every casino offers if the casino registers with the Nevada Gaming Commission.\footnote{116} In Delaware, sports betting is limited to the state’s three casinos, at least for the time being.\footnote{117} Expanded sports betting options could take place at additional locations or online.\footnote{118} As Governor John Carney described, Delaware’s regulatory authority is “a full-scale sports gaming operation.”\footnote{119} In New Jersey, every casino and racetrack in the state can offer sports betting, provided they are approved to do so by the New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement and the Casino Control Commission.\footnote{120} In Mississippi, sports betting is limited to water- and land-based casinos.\footnote{121} Additionally, any current gaming license holder can apply to the Mississippi Gaming Commission to offer sports betting.\footnote{122} Finally, in West Virginia, lawmakers approved sports betting at the state’s five casinos.\footnote{123} Moreover, casinos can submit requests to West Virginia’s Lottery Commission
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for immediate commencement of sports pool or online sports pool operations.\textsuperscript{124} By following the approaches of other states, Indiana legislators can craft a top-quality plan for their bill before the General Assembly adjourns for the year in March.\textsuperscript{125}

\textbf{B. Online Betting}

The second provision that the Bill should include is to allow for online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications. Online betting is an important issue because recent studies estimate that online sports betting could be 40 to 45 percent of the sports betting marketplace.\textsuperscript{126} Allowing online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications is the best approach for Indiana because (1) it will allow Indiana to compete with the black market including offshore sportsbooks; (2) it will create more revenue for Indiana; and (3) it will allow Indiana to stay competitive with every state that has legalized sports betting and neighboring states who will legalize it in the future.

The Bill needs to include online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications because it will allow Indiana to compete with the black market of illegal sports betting.\textsuperscript{127} Though bettors will have the option to travel to a land-based casino to place legal bets, many could also opt for illegal betting unless the state allows for online betting platforms.\textsuperscript{128} In a recent survey, 71 percent of participating Indiana residents stated that they would not stop placing illegal bets if sports betting was only available at the nearest local casino, and there was no mobile application or website.\textsuperscript{129} In the same survey, 67 percent of Indiana residents stated that they place most of their illegal bets online.\textsuperscript{130} If online betting is not a part of Indiana’s legislation, the president of the Casino Association of Indiana believes that the black market would continue to thrive.\textsuperscript{131} The online sports betting black market is an illegal, but profitable, sports betting operation run by foreign companies.\textsuperscript{132} Including online betting provisions in the Bill will help prevent individuals from opting for
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illegal options such as offshore sportsbooks to place their sports bets, and thereby prevent foreign companies from taking betting revenues that otherwise belong in this state.\textsuperscript{133}

A provision in the Bill that allows casinos to offer online sports betting will allow Indiana to compete with offshore sportsbooks.\textsuperscript{134} The advantages provided by offshore sportsbooks are pricing, mobile/web-based platforms, online registration, and expansive betting options.\textsuperscript{135} Scott Cooley, an odds consultant for offshore sportsbook BetDSI, stated that “Offshore books . . . that almost exclusively cater to U.S. clientele will always have a place in the industry because there will always be a sector of gamblers that wish to remain anonymous and/or shop for the best odds.”\textsuperscript{136} In other words, some level of black market activity is inevitable, but there are steps Indiana can take to limit the black market competition more effectively.

To compete with offshore sportsbooks, Indiana needs to offer the same level of access and advantages that offshore sportsbooks provide and capitalize on things that offshore sportsbooks cannot offer.\textsuperscript{137} First, allowing online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications will permit Indiana to offer the same access and advantage of offshore sportsbooks.\textsuperscript{138} As the Associate Director of the International Center for Gaming Regulation Jennifer Roberts stated, “[o]nce you legalize sports betting, it’s not like everyone’s going to shut down their accounts in the offshore market and suddenly start betting in a legal sportsbook, especially if there’s not the same level of access or the 10 cent lines.”\textsuperscript{139}

Second, to compete with offshore sportsbooks, Indiana needs to capitalize on things that offshore sportsbooks cannot offer such as a regulated payment dispute process provided by the IGC.\textsuperscript{140} Individuals who want to dispute payments from offshore sportsbooks face risks such as the sportsbook not having a dispute process, and the potential of the foreign government shutting down the offshore sportsbook.\textsuperscript{141} Moreover, by dealing with offshore sportsbooks, individuals will not have the ability to have a quality in-person customer experience such as a nice sportsbook lounge and free drinks.\textsuperscript{142} Ultimately, it is
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difficult to foresee any scenario in which offshore sportsbooks disappear entirely, but allowing online sports betting only through Indiana Casino platforms will certainly have an effect in limiting illegal offshore sportsbooks.  

Online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications will also create more revenue for Indiana and its casinos. Indiana State Representative Alan Morrison stated: “It would be pretty important, moving forward with [sports betting], that we recognize the importance of mobile gaming and how it could really increase the revenue.” For example, in Mississippi, online betting is allowed only inside casinos, and the total handle from August to September was $9.8 million, which resulted in just $54,000 in revenue for the state. In contrast, in New Jersey, which permits online and mobile betting, sports bettors placed more than $95 million in total bets during August creating about $9.2 million in revenue for casinos and racetracks. Moreover, New Jersey collected 8.5 percent of the casinos and racetracks’ $9.2 million, which generated a revenue of $765,000 for the state. Additionally, the study by Eilers and Krejcik revealed that online betting could turn into the main driver of growth of the state’s betting market and that if Indiana only legalizes betting in casinos and not online betting, the projected revenue will be approximately $25 million less. If Indiana legislators do not include online sports betting at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications in their Bill, Indiana will be missing out on potential revenue like Mississippi and fail to maximize their revenue stream like New Jersey.

Finally, Indiana should include online betting in its Bill to stay competitive with every state that has legalized sports betting and neighboring states who will
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legalize it in the future. In Nevada, the sport betting laws require anyone registering for a mobile sports betting account to do so physically at a Nevada casino. Additionally, online sports bettors must be in Nevada to place a bet. In Delaware, current laws limit gambling to those physically present in a licensed casino, but state officials have indicated that they intend to consider expansion of online betting in the future. In New Jersey, the sports betting law includes provisions for casinos to permit online and mobile betting anywhere within the state’s borders. Mississippi only permits online sports betting conducted on-site, which means that no mobile or online betting can take place outside a casino. West Virginia will soon allow for online and mobile sports betting, but individuals must be located within the state to place an online sports bet. Additionally, Kentucky, Illinois, and Ohio are expected to have legalized sports betting allowing for online sports betting in the next four years. As Indiana State Representative Alan Morrison stated, “[t]he ramifications . . . would be on the state’s casinos if neighboring states have legal sports gambling and Indiana does not.” By allowing for online sports betting at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications, Indiana can stay competitive with states that allow for online sports betting, and with neighboring states that will soon allow for online sports betting.

C. Who to Bet on?

The third provision the Bill should include is that any individual placing sports bets in Indiana are allowed to bet on any professional sports teams and any collegiate team except for Indiana collegiate teams. The reason behind this limitation is that professional leagues pay their athletes so much that they are unlikely to risk their careers by fixing games or shaving points, but college
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players are vulnerable to illicit offers because they do not get paid. Additionally, there is a worry that gamblers, including classmates and neighbors, will try to acquire confidential data from insiders about injuries or academic standing to get a competitive edge. On the other hand, betting on college sports is a substantial revenue source; as Americans bet about $10 billion every year in the NCAA men’s college basketball tournament, and college football accounted for about 40 percent of all football bets placed in Nevada. Nonetheless, states like New Jersey that do not allow individuals to place bets in New Jersey on New Jersey collegiate teams have enjoyed economic success during the college football season. In September 2018, individuals in New Jersey bet $184 million on sports (up from nearly $95 million in August), giving state casinos $24 million in revenue and the state $2 million in tax revenue. In November 2018, New Jersey’s revenue increased to $2.45 million, with college and professional football accounting for $328 million of the sports bets in the state since June. To strike a balance, a provision that allows any individual placing bets in Indiana to bet only on college teams that are not from Indiana will reduce risks of match-fixing and sharing of confidential information; it will also allow Indiana to enjoy the substantial revenue of college sports.

The Murphy decision has reignited the debate on whether the NCCA should pay their college athletes. Currently, college athletes are the most vulnerable athletes because they are unpaid, unlike professionals “whose multimillion dollar
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salaries should make them think twice about succumbing to corruption." The majority of college athletes have no chance of playing at the professional level, making them vulnerable to financial lures. Thus, if the NCAA paid their athletes, this section of analysis would allow for individuals placing a sports bet in Indiana to bet on Indiana college teams. However, whether the NCAA should pay their athletes is beyond the scope of this Note.

D. Who Regulates Sports Betting?

The Bill should include a provision that allows the IGC to regulate sports betting because it already has an existing casino licensing structure. The IGC should use its existing casino license structure instead of different stand-alone parlors to create a sports betting licensing structure and ease the sports betting transition in Indiana. As Senator Ron Alting stated, “[w]hy reinvent the wheel if you already have one?” By allowing the IGC to use its casino licensing structure, Indiana will mirror the Nevada licensing model, in which casinos need a sports betting license to allow people to place bets in their sportsbooks. Moreover, using Indiana’s existing casino licensing structure to create a sports betting license structure will enable the state to move quickly to legalize sports betting, because the risks of delaying sports betting beyond 2020 outweigh the rewards.

The Bill should include a provision that allows the IGC to regulate sports betting because the IGC has begun studying the implications of sports betting. The IGC is prepared to add sports betting to its portfolio should Indiana decide to legalize it. In August 2018, the IGC agreed to a two-year contract with Eilers & Krejcik Gaming to advise legislators and regulators about the possibilities of Indiana sports betting. Moreover, IGC Executive Director Sara Tait stated that sports betting “is something that has been successfully regulated (elsewhere) for years, so we’re not going to have to reinvent the wheel.” State Senator Ron Alting alluded that legislators want to write the best bill; by letting the ICG regulate sports betting, Indiana is one step closer to creating the best bill.
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IV. INDIANA SPORTS BETTING TAXATION FRAMEWORK

A. Licensing Fees

Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 initial licensing fee for any of the seventeen betting facilities that want to offer sports betting to generate substantial income and compete with the black market.\textsuperscript{179} A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month.\textsuperscript{180} Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee.\textsuperscript{181} Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.”\textsuperscript{182} Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market.\textsuperscript{183} A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators.\textsuperscript{184} In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.”\textsuperscript{185} To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service.\textsuperscript{186} A $100,000 initial licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.

One of the critical issues for Indiana legislators is what a reasonable sports betting licensing fee would be for casinos offering the service. A $100,000 licensing fee will generate substantial income because states like New Jersey, which has a $100,000 licensing fee, generated as much as $2.6 million in tax revenue from sports betting in one month. Additionally, a $100,000 initial licensing fee is not ridiculous, like Pennsylvania’s proposed $10 million initial licensing fee. Greg Carlin, CEO of Rush Street Gaming stated, “if legal sports betting is going to be a regulated and successful business, the tax rates can’t be so high that it makes it impossible to compete with the black market.” Moreover, unreasonable licensing fees, like the $10 million licensing fee in Pennsylvania, make casinos in the state hesitant to get in the sports betting industry feeding to the growth of the black market. A report by Eilers & Krejcik found that “lower licensing fees will generally attract more license applicants and, in turn, yield higher levels of operator/supplier participation, whereas higher fees may attract fewer applicants and yield correspondingly lower levels of participation” by casino operators. In turn, the wider availability of sports betting in Indiana “will result in a greater transfer of demand from the black market to the regulated market.” To generate revenue and compete with the black market, Indiana legislators need to propose a $100,000 licensing fee.
licensing fee would be reasonable because other states that have legalized sports betting have implemented a similar fee. In Delaware, “[t]he state’s three casinos function as a combined licensee, and they share the cost of licensure based on their slot contribution to the state.” In New Jersey, an initial sports wagering license is $100,000, which is renewable every year. In Mississippi, “any current gaming license holder can apply to offer sports betting.” Moreover, each applicant for a license to conduct gaming must submit an application fee of $5,000, and each licensee must pay an annual license fee of $5,000. In West Virginia, licensing fees are $100,000 for a one-year term. A $100,000 licensing fee is reasonable because it is similar to what three other states that have recently legalized sports betting have done, which is why Indiana legislators should propose it in their Bill.

B. Yearly Tax-Rate

Indiana legislators need to implement a 9.75 percent tax rate on each casino’s sports betting yearly gross revenue to create substantial revenue for the Hoosier state. During an October 2018 meeting, Matt Bell of the Casino Association of Indiana recommended Indiana legislators implement a single-digit tax rate. “The opening day of Delaware sports betting generated $322,135 in handle.” Using an 8 percent tax rate, the Delaware handle will generate $1,423 daily revenue and $519,395 annual revenue. By using a 10 percent tax rate, Delaware will generate a handle of $1,778 daily revenue and $648,970 annual revenue. A report by Eilers & Krejcik Gaming estimated that by using a 9.75 percent tax on gross revenue plus licensing fees for operators, Indiana’s annual tax revenue from sports betting would be $38 million in the fifth year. A 9.75 percent tax will generate substantial revenue for Indiana, as shown by Eilers & Krejcik Gaming report, which states real-world examples like Delaware that use a similar
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yearly tax rate.\textsuperscript{199}

A 9.75 percent tax rate on casinos’ sports betting yearly gross revenue will allow the state to compete with the black market.\textsuperscript{200} Setting high tax rates risks alienating customers, because the sportsbook operators might slightly increase the percentage deducted from the customers’ winnings.\textsuperscript{201} The money deducted will “add up over time” and make customers “more likely to turn toward offshore websites or their local bookie to place their wagers.”\textsuperscript{202} As a consequence, Indiana will not “get a cent of tax revenue” from those bets.\textsuperscript{203} The American Gaming Association estimates that Americans illegally bet $150 billion in sports each year; if Indiana imposes a high tax rate, it will alienate customers and “ensure that the black market remains healthy.”\textsuperscript{204}

\textbf{C. Integrity Fees}

Indiana legislators need to pass a bill that pays no integrity fee from the state’s sports betting yearly gross revenue to the professional leagues. Integrity fees are taxes on legal sports betting, which transfer money from the sportsbooks to sports’ governing bodies.\textsuperscript{205} The NBA and MLB popularized the concept of integrity fees as the professional leagues try to find a way to profit from the rapid increase of sports betting in the United States.\textsuperscript{206} The professional leagues proposed the concept of integrity fees to the states, which would tax a sportsbook’s handle at a rate of 1 percent, payable to each league on which sports wagering would occur.\textsuperscript{207} Later, the professional leagues brought the integrity fee rate down to 0.25 percent. Currently, no states have enacted integrity fees as part of their sports betting legislation, and Indiana was the only state to propose an integrity fee in 2018 with Representative Morrison’s bill.\textsuperscript{208} The intended advantage of integrity fees is to bring legal, transparent sports betting to Indiana.\textsuperscript{209} However, professional sports leagues have existing incentives to
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protect the integrity of their sporting events and do not need integrity fees as inducements for honest conduct.\textsuperscript{210} Indiana’s bill should not include integrity fees because integrity fees take away from the state’s revenue, hurt consumers, and hurt legal betting operators. To make integrity fees work, Indiana would likely have to lower its own revenue streams to pay the leagues, which would in turn hurt the state’s revenue.\textsuperscript{211} Integrity fees will also hurt consumers because the cost of doing business will increase for legal sportsbooks, so they will likely attempt to pass that cost to consumers.\textsuperscript{212} Integrity fees will also hurt legal betting operators because an increase in the cost for customers will make it more difficult for legal betting operators to compete with illegal betting options.\textsuperscript{213} If the General Assembly decides to pass legislation that requires paying an integrity fee to professional sports leagues, Indiana’s legislators will have abdicated their duty to prioritize Hoosiers and Indiana businesses.

Indiana’s Bill needs to exclude an integrity fee because the professional leagues have not explained their need for the fee.\textsuperscript{214} Professional leagues have not asked for integrity fees in Nevada, where sports betting has been legal for decades.\textsuperscript{215} The professional leagues argue that the fee will go toward covering their increased cost burden to ensure integrity from legalized sports betting.\textsuperscript{216} However, the leagues would play no functional role in the sports betting industry because the states would regulate it, and the sportsbooks would operate it.\textsuperscript{217} Moreover, some question whether the lack of integrity fees means that professional leagues are not currently providing sufficient oversight.\textsuperscript{218} As Art Manteris, the VP of Race and Sport for Station Casinos stated, “So if they don’t get paid, will they not provide integrity?”\textsuperscript{219} Additionally, professional leagues have failed to discuss what leagues or organizations are entitled to a cut of the
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fees. Would the integrity fees extend to USL, WNBA, IndyCar Racing, Motorsports, or the NCAA? There are many questions that the professional leagues must answer before Indiana incorporates integrity fees into its legislation.

V. IMPLEMENTATION

A. Match-Fixing

The first implementation consideration Indiana legislators need to consider before legalizing sports betting is match-fixing. The three types of activities that individuals commonly associate with match-fixing are point shaving, tanking, and spot-fixing. In the aftermath of the Murphy decision, professional and collegiate leagues argue that without the federal protection of the PASPA, sports betting will expose its games and athletes to match-fixing, thereby creating a problem for state legislators.

Most leagues are probably not susceptible to match-fixing because they do not have an issue with poorly compensated players or referees. However, collegiate-level sports may prove problematic with regard to match-fixing. The problem of collegiate-level sports lies with the NCAA, which does not allow for direct compensation beyond tuition and grants in aid for their student-athletes. The lack of compensation for student-athletes could leave them “particularly vulnerable to match fixers, especially if they were to come into a time of financial hardship.” A 2016 NCAA survey of more than 22,000 college athletes found nearly one-fourth of male athletes had violated NCAA rules by gambling on sports within the previous year.
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Enacting a provision in the Bill that allows for individuals to bet only on college teams that are not in Indiana should reduce the risk of match-fixing.\footnote{230} This provision in the Bill will reduce the worry that gamblers, including classmates and neighbors, will try to acquire confidential data from insiders about injuries or academic standing to get a competitive edge.\footnote{231} Additionally, the state legislature could petition for the NCAA to pay athletes to reduce match-fixing concerns.\footnote{232} The NCAA is a multibillion-dollar business that makes money off of athletes in the form of TV deals, ticket sales, and jersey sales.\footnote{233} The NCAA paying student-athletes may not only be fair, but it could help end the match-fixing concerns.\footnote{234}

\textbf{B. Gambling Addiction}

The second implementation consideration that Indiana legislators need to consider is gambling addiction. An estimated 5.4 million Americans battle gambling addiction, yet 20 percent of states do not dedicate any funds toward gambling addiction.\footnote{235} According to Marlene Warner, President of the National Center on Problem Gambling Board of Directors, “the expansion of legalized sports gambling in the United States will likely increase gambling participation and gambling problems unless steps are taken to minimize harm.”\footnote{236} As Neva Pryor, who runs New Jersey’s Council on Compulsive Gambling stated, “[w]e’re going to be adding fuel to the fire of an already serious problem.”\footnote{237} In 2016, an estimated 1.2 percent of Indiana adults (60,573) are believed to manifest a
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gambling problem.\textsuperscript{238} Thus, states that have proposed or will propose sports betting regulations are fearful about the potential increase of gambling addiction.\textsuperscript{239}

This note proposes two solutions to battle the gambling addiction in Indiana. The first solution is giving 1 percent of the state’s sports betting yearly tax revenue to fund compulsive gambling programs, and the second solution is giving 50 percent of the casinos licensing fees to fund compulsive gambling programs.\textsuperscript{240} The National Council on Problem Gambling (“NCPG”) wants any company, sports league, or government that benefits from sports betting to devote at least 1 percent of the revenue to fund programs that prevent and treat compulsive gambling.\textsuperscript{241} Moreover, the NCPG wants betting operators to train staff about problem gambling, to set and enforce a minimum age limit, and to enable gamblers to set limits on how much time and money they spend betting.\textsuperscript{242} Indiana could also follow New Jersey’s approach, where the Division of Gaming Enforcement gives 50 percent of fees from sports betting licenses to the state’s council on compulsive gambling.\textsuperscript{243} However, some New Jersey legislators think it is too early to identify any potential implications, like gambling addiction, from legalization of sports betting in the state.\textsuperscript{244} By proposing one of the two solutions, Indiana legislators can prevent overlooking the potential risks involved with sports betting.\textsuperscript{245}

\textit{C. Economic Ramifications}

The third implementation consideration that Indiana legislators need to consider is the economic ramifications of the Bill. The first economic ramification is the impact the Bill can bring to Indiana casinos.\textsuperscript{246} Caesars, owner of Horseshoe Casino in Hammond, bought two central Indiana racetrack and casino facilities previously owned by Centaur Holdings for $1.7 billion.\textsuperscript{247} Mark Frissora, president and CEO of Caesars Entertainment, stated, “Indiana will be our largest market after this acquisition, besides Nevada.”\textsuperscript{248}
Hoosier Park see more than 6.5 million guests combined each year and serve more than 1.1 million members as part of its loyalty program. Moreover, the president of Boyd Gaming, Keith Smith, said that he “views the expansion of sports betting as a growth opportunity.” Boyd Gaming is in the process of purchasing Belterra Casino Resort & Spa in southeastern Indiana. Indiana has a mature casino market with thirteen properties, and in 2017 had the fifth most revenue from gambling. Thus, Indiana legislators need to consider the economic impact of casinos because, with nearly 6.7 million residents, Indiana is a great market opportunity for all of the major casinos.

The second economic ramification is the substantial positive economic impact that the Bill could bring to the Hoosier state. According to Eilers and Krejcik, the legalization of both retail and online betting in the state could generate $56.2 million in direct economic impact in year one. By the fifth year, “sports betting could generate $466 million annually in statewide economic impact” if the Indiana General Assembly legalizes it. “Analysts project 729 full-time equivalent jobs by the fifth year.” Moreover, additional revenue will benefit the state, as Indiana Representative Alan Morrison stated, “if we can add, say, $20 million to the budget that wasn’t there before, it’s worthwhile.” Indiana legislators need to consider the economic impact on the Hoosier state because a projected $466 million annually in statewide economic impact is substantial.
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D. Marketing Strategies

Sports fans and prospective sports bettors are certain to be greeted by massive advertising and marketing campaigns if a legal sports betting market becomes available. In Indiana, sports betting will be an important marketing tool as state casinos have seen recent years of declining revenue due to the “increased competition from surrounding states and tribal casinos.” As Indiana is debating whether to legalize sports betting, casinos and licensed betting operators need to consider how they will use sports betting as a marketing tool to increase revenue and alienate the black market.

Indiana casinos should use sports betting as a marketing tool by first sending an educationally focused message for less knowledgeable bettors to inform them on the illegality of offshore sportsbooks. The educational-based message will gradually appeal the less knowledge bettors to the recreational components of legalized sports betting, such as the social aspects of sports betting. The casinos’ ads focusing on the recreational aspects of sports betting should also pop up on individuals’ phones and computers, because “online advertisers are expected to outspend TV advertisers by $40 billion this year.” Then, Indiana casinos should approach bigger, more data-driven and disciplined players, mainly through online advertising, to sway them away from offshore markets and their local bookmaker. Additionally, Indiana casinos should highlight the ease of using online platforms to sway both types of bettors away from offshore markets and their local bookmaker.

The marketing of sports betting needs to have elements that appeal to both groups of sports bettors, and the casino that does this better will be the most profitable.

Indiana Casinos should also use event marketing such as bar promotions, sporting events promotions, and sport team sponsorships to promote legal sports betting platforms. Indiana casinos can create marketing partnerships with sports
bars to target an audience that is already committed to watching sports.\textsuperscript{270} Casinos can offer bar patrons a gift card or other incentives in exchange for an online casino application download or a sports bet if the customer has the application already.\textsuperscript{271} Additionally, sports bars can create a themed night around sports betting to attract new customers to visit and find out more information about sports betting.\textsuperscript{272} Ultimately, it is difficult to foresee any scenario in which the black market and offshore sportsbooks will disappear,\textsuperscript{273} but Indiana should use marketing as a tool to promote legal sports betting and reduce access to the black market.

Indiana casinos should also market sports betting at select events that draw sports fan attendees, such as sporting events or beer festivals.\textsuperscript{274} The casinos should include an activation booth that incorporates a fun consumer promotion to encourage online casino application downloads and sports bets.\textsuperscript{275} Moreover, casinos trying to drive customers to their properties can distribute a “bounce back” coupon that includes a special offer that is effective only on-site.\textsuperscript{276} Finally, Indiana casinos can become the sponsor of a professional sports team to further draw fans who are already excited by the in-stadium experience to a compelling promotion that connects sports betting with their favorite team.\textsuperscript{277} By using event marketing, Indiana casinos can set themselves apart from competitors, grab new customers, and create a loyal sports betting customer base.\textsuperscript{278}

**VI. CONCLUSION**

In May 2018, the Supreme Court of the United States struck down the provision of the PASPA prohibiting state authorization of sports gambling schemes.\textsuperscript{279} The Court held that the PASPA’s provision prohibiting state authorization of sports gambling schemes violates the anti-commandeering rule of the Tenth Amendment.\textsuperscript{280} The Court reasoned that the provision “unequivocally dictates what a state legislature may and may not do.”\textsuperscript{281} Therefore, the states are now free to choose whether to legalize sports betting.

The *Murphy* decision has Indiana legislators weighing the implications of
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sports betting including where the betting will occur, how to tax and spend the revenue from the newly legal activity, and what whether collegiate teams are appropriate for betting.\textsuperscript{282} This Note has argued that Indiana legislators need to pass legislation to legalize sports betting to take advantage of the enormous revenue-raising opportunity.\textsuperscript{283} To take advantage of the revenue-raising opportunity, this Note outlined the proposed Bill the legislation should pass. First, the Bill should include a provision that allows sports betting only at Indiana’s fourteen licensed casinos, and four licensed betting facilities. Second, the Bill should include a provision that allows for online sports betting onsite at the casinos and offsite from casino websites or phone applications. Third, the Bill should include a provision that allows individuals to bet on any professional sports teams, but only collegiate teams that are not from Indiana. Fourth, the Bill should include a provision that enables the IGC to regulate sports betting.

This Note also discussed the taxation framework that Indiana legislators should include in the Bill. First, Indiana needs to charge a $100,000 licensing fee for any of the seventeen betting facilities that want to hold sports betting. Second, Indiana needs to tax the casinos and betting operators 9.75 percent of their yearly gross revenue from sports betting. Third, Indiana’s taxation framework should not pay an integrity fee from their annual sports betting revenue to the professional leagues. Finally, this Note explores different implementation considerations such as match-fixing, gambling addiction, economic impact, and marketing strategies that Indiana legislators need to consider before legalizing sports betting.
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