TRIBAL ALLIANCE OF SOVEREIGN INDIAN NATIONS

HISTORY OF SPORTS WAGERING
Sports wagering is nothing new.

Evidence of sports wagering dates back to ancient times.
Wagering on chariot racing, horses, and athletic combat was common in Ancient Rome.

At its height, Rome itself had 7 different race tracks. This was a popular sport and a popular wagering activity for Romans.
HISTORY OF SPORTS WAGERING

Romans also provided us with the first known wagering laws.

Wagering on things other than sports and race went through periods of prohibition and permissiveness.

At all times, wagering on races and athletic contests appear to have been permitted and governed.

HISTORY OF SPORTS WAGERING

As the Roman Republic and Empire spread, so did the Roman past times of racing and athletic combat as well as wagering on such activities.
HISTORY OF SPORTS WAGERING

An inscription on the mosaic of an African bath house says of a favorite horse:
"Vincas, non vincas, te amamus, Polydoxe!": Win or lose we love you Polydoxes!

Sports wagering continued to flourish through varying degrees of legality and illegality throughout the Roman world.
Gambling in the middle ages was divided in part by economic class. The rich indulged in wagering on horse racing, cock fighting or other blood sports, while the poor often engaged in dice games.

In 1190 kings Richard of England and Phillip of France of the crusades found it necessary to have a law drawn up settling just who could and who could not gamble, and for how much.
Horse racing was a popular wagering sport for as long as history records the use of horses by men. Horse racing was used to improve bloodstock and wagering on racing was common place in nearly all cultures.

In the 16th century, we see the first preserved evidence of organized horse racing and wagering in Great Britain. King James I of Scotland is mentioned attending and wagering on races on the Sands at Leith in 1504.
In the mid 17th century, Oliver Cromwell, an Independent Puritan rose to power in the United Kingdom. During Cromwellian times, horse racing and wagering were suppressed as dangerous assemblies.

During the reign of Charles II, racing and race wagering made a return to British society. As a British historian noted that during this time, “early racing took the form of matches, direct head to head competition with one owner matching his horse against another. Invariably there was a wager on the outcome, and any number of side bets. Betting was in reality the very purpose of racing”.
Betting on horse racing at this time was known as 'match betting' and was generally unorganized and without recourse to bookmakers.

Members of the public would strike bets with each other and even offer odds.

In the 17th and 18th centuries, horse racing and wagering in Britain was a mainstay of recreational activities.

This love of horse racing made its way to British colonies, including those in the Americas.
In Britain, horse racing and wagering expanded so rapidly in the 18th century, that over 120 towns in Britain were holding races for wagering.

This was the catalyst for the Gambling Act of 1739, which stated “the Great Number of Horse Races for Small Plates, Prizes or Sums of Money, have contributed very much to the Encouragement of Idleness, to the Impoverishment of the meaner Sort of Subjects of the Kingdom”.

The Gambling Act of 1739 was an early attempt to preserve horse racing and horse race wagering for the aristocracy. Public interest in the sport had removed the cachet of it for the rich. Additionally its popularity reduced prize levels significantly and wagering amounts significantly.

Subsequently, the Gambling Act insisted that every race would have to have an entrance fee and a prize of £50. This was sufficient enough to disqualify a large proportion of would-be racehorse owners from competing in horse racing.
Undeterred by the Gambling Act of 1739, illegal horse races became prolific in Britain. So much so that the sport and wagering on the sport was becoming disorderly and attracting disorderly crowds.

In the 18th century, modern bookmaking began to take hold.

This was in response to a transformation in horse racing from head-to-head racing to large field racing.

To accept wagering on races with large fields of horses, a bookmaker would set odds on a particular horse or horses for wagering. In the early 1800's these were 'one with the field' odds. Generally, selecting one winner from the field.
“One-with-the-field Odds” became increasingly unpopular as the size of the field grew.

In response, bookmakers developed a system to take wagers on any horse in the field, where odds would change in an effort to keep the bookmaker in balance.

Tracks were quick to enter the bookmaking business as an additional source of revenue. However, the difficulty in maintaining balance among wagerers proved dangerous.

It was the bookmaker, and in the case of track books, the track, that stood to gain or lose based on the bets placed by spectators.

Ineffective risk management caused great hardship for many tracks and bookmakers.
In 1867, a Catalan inventor, Joseph Oller, developed a system to guarantee a profit for bookmakers.

His system pooled wagers and recalculated odds as wagers were placed. The pool could then provide a payment to the track or bookmaker, then return the remainder as prizes to winning bettors.

The system was called the “pari-mutuel” wagering system.

Pari-mutuel wagering met with limited success until the invention of the totalizer board in the early 1900s.

The totalizer board allowed betters to see the current odds and the change in odds as wagers were placed.

In 1927, the first totalizer board was installed at Arlington Race track in Illinois.
Meanwhile, in the 1800s a new game in America was growing in popularity. Baseball was becoming a national pastime to rival horse racing. Just as with horse racing, wagering on baseball was not uncommon.

In the 1800s there was a relaxed attitude toward betting on baseball. For example, in 1894, the Washington Post reported that "Uncle Anson (Manager of the Chicago Colts) has already started making wagers on the position the Chicago Colts will have in the race for the National League Pennant next year. He put up $100 a few days ago that his team would finish higher up in the race than the Pittsburgh Pirates."
In the late 1800s and early 1900s, sports wagering was generally an acceptable form of unregulated wagering.

Since the time baseball became a spectator sport, there were allegations of cheating and match fixing. By the time of the turn of the 20th Century, the term “hippodroming” became part of the lexicon to reference games exhibited or fixed for gambling purposes.

In 1919, the Chicago White Sox were one of the best teams in baseball.

The team had won a championship in 1917, and in 1919 it was expected to do so once again.

While the Chicago White Sox were good, their owner, Charles Comiskey, was well known for his miserly ways, and it was well known that players were underpaid.
In 1919, baseball player contracts had a reserve clause that prevented players from negotiating or playing for other teams. Thus, the underpaid Chicago White Sox players had no bargaining power for higher wages, despite the fact that their performance was superior to most players in the league.

The Chicago White Sox lost the 1919 world series, and many speculated that key players threw the series in order to get a payoff from a bookmaker.
In the early 20th century, Nevada saw the growth of Turf Clubs and sports books. Turf Clubs were stand alone sports betting locations (not part of a Casino).

Meanwhile, many other states were quick to prohibit sports wagering and bookmaking. Pennsylvania Title 18 § 5514. Pool selling and bookmaking.

A person is guilty of a misdemeanor of the first degree if he:
(1) engages in pool selling or bookmaking;
(2) occupies any place for the purpose of receiving, recording or registering bets or wagers, or of selling pools;
(3) receives, records, registers, forwards, or purports or pretends to forward, to another, any bet or wager upon the result of any political nomination, appointment or election, or upon any contest of any nature;
(4) becomes the custodian or depository, for gain or ward, of any property staked, wagered or pledged, or to be staked, wagered, or pledged upon any such result; or
(5) being the owner, lessee, or occupant of any premises, knowingly permits or suffers the same, to be used or occupied for any of such purposes.
Florida - Chapter - 849.25  “Bookmaking” defined; penalties; exceptions.—
(1)(a) The term “bookmaking” means the act of taking or receiving, while engaged in the business or profession of gambling, any bet or wager upon the result of any trial or contest of skill, speed, power, or endurance of human, beast, fowl, motor vehicle, or mechanical apparatus or upon the result of any chance, casualty, unknown, or contingent event whatsoever.
(b) The following factors shall be considered in making a determination that a person has engaged in the offense of bookmaking:
1. Taking advantage of betting odds created to produce a profit for the bookmaker or charging a percentage on accepted wagers.
2. Placing all or part of accepted wagers with other bookmakers to reduce the chance of financial loss.
3. Taking or receiving more than five wagers in any single day.
4. Taking or receiving wagers totaling more than $500 in any single day, or more than $1,500 in any single week.
5. Engaging in a common scheme with two or more persons to take or receive wagers.
6. Taking or receiving wagers on both sides on a contest at the identical point spread.
7. Any other factor relevant to establishing that the operating procedures of such person are commercial in nature.
(c) The existence of any two factors listed in paragraph (b) may constitute prima facie evidence of a commercial bookmaking operation.
(2) Any person who engages in bookmaking shall be guilty of a felony of the third degree, punishable as

In Nevada, the sports pool and race businesses become integrated within casinos.
Nevada race books, which had hand-booked wagers since opening, joined the national pari-mutuel system of wagering in the late 1980s.

Since then, Nevada has divided the race and sports pool operations into two separate licensed activities:

NRS 463.01855  “Race book” defined.  “Race book” means the business of accepting wagers upon the outcome of any event held at a track which uses the pari-mutuel system of wagering.

NRS 463.0193  “Sports pool” defined.  “Sports pool” means the business of accepting wagers on sporting events or other events by any system or method of wagering.
While Nevada regulated sports wagering, few other states did so. Meanwhile, the Federal Government enacted laws that prohibited the interstate conduct of sports wagering and prohibited states that didn’t have legal and regulated sports wagering from doing so in the future.

**PASPA**

- Senator Deconcini of Arizona introduced the Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act (the “Act”) because of the impending threat of state-sponsored sports lotteries.
- Because of the threat posed by state lotteries, the bill focused on state-sponsored sports wagering.
- According to Senator Deconcini, the “bill serves an important public purpose, to stop the spread of state-sponsored sports gambling.”
Senator Bill Bradley also championed the bill because he believed that state-sponsored sports wagering puts the “imprimatur of the state on the activity” by creating the perception that sports gambling is ok.

Sec. 3702. Unlawful sports gambling
It shall be unlawful for -
(1) a governmental entity to sponsor, operate, advertise, promote, license, or authorize by law or compact, or
(2) a person to sponsor, operate, advertise, or promote, pursuant to the law or compact of a governmental entity, a lottery, sweepstakes, or other betting, gambling, or wagering scheme based, directly or indirectly (through the use of geographical references or otherwise), on one or more competitive games in which amateur or professional athletes participate, or are intended to participate, or on one or more performances of such athletes in such games.

(2) the term "governmental entity" means a State, a political subdivision of a State, or an entity or organization, including an entity or organization described in section 4(5) of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2702(5)), that has governmental authority within the territorial boundaries of the United States, including on lands described in section 4(4) of such Act (25 U.S.C. 2703(4)).
Sec. 3704. Applicability

Section 3702 shall not apply to:

(1) a lottery, sweepstakes, or other betting, gambling, or wagering scheme in operation in a State or other governmental entity, to the extent that the scheme was conducted by that State or other governmental entity at any time during the period beginning January 1, 1976, and ending August 31, 1990;

(2) a lottery, sweepstakes, or other betting, gambling, or wagering scheme in operation in a State or other governmental entity where both:

(A) such scheme was authorized by a statute as in effect on October 2, 1991; and

(B) a scheme described in section 3702 (other than one based on parimutuel animal racing or jai-alai games) actually was conducted in that State or other governmental entity at any time during the period beginning September 1, 1989, and ending October 2, 1991, pursuant to the law of that State or other governmental entity;
Sec. 3704. Applicability

- Section 3702 shall not apply to -
  - (3) a betting, gambling, or wagering scheme, other than a lottery described in paragraph (1), conducted exclusively in casinos located in a municipality, but only to the extent that -
    - (A) such scheme or a similar scheme was authorized, not later than one year after the effective date of this chapter, to be operated in that municipality; and
    - (B) any commercial casino gaming scheme was in operation in such municipality throughout the 10-year period ending on such effective date pursuant to a comprehensive system of State regulation authorized by that State's constitution and applicable solely to such municipality; or
  - (4) parimutuel animal racing or jai-alai games.

States that fall within the exemption:
- Nevada
- Delaware
- Montana
- Oregon
SPORTS WAGERING IN AMERICA

New Jersey's Appeal of Sports Betting Ban Heads to Supreme Court

The Supreme Court agreed to hear arguments in a case involving Chris Christie, the governor of New Jersey, who has sought to allow sports betting at professional and collegiate sports in the state's casinos and racetracks.
New Jersey, which had the exemption aimed at it expire, is challenging the constitutionality of PASPA.

The issue has been granted review by the U.S. Supreme Court. The issue presented is whether PASPA unconstitutionally commandeers state government to enforce federal policy.

The Solicitor General recommended against granting the review because the issue only applies to one state at this time, there is no disagreement between the circuits, and the question is limited to the application to governments not those relying on laws enacted by governments.

Sec. 3702. Unlawful sports gambling
It shall be unlawful for -
(1) a governmental entity to sponsor, operate, advertise, promote, license, or authorize by law or compact, or
(2) a person to sponsor, operate, advertise, or promote, pursuant to the law or compact of a governmental entity, a lottery, sweepstakes, or other betting, gambling, or wagering scheme based, directly or indirectly (through the use of geographical references or otherwise), on one or more competitive games in which amateur or professional athletes participate, or are intended to participate, or on one or more performances of such athletes in such games.
For 2016, the Nevada market experienced $4.5 billion of wagers placed with a win in excess of $219 million and a win percentage of 4.86%.

Estimates range between $150 billion and $450 billion with regard to the amount wagered illegally on sports in the U.S.

Therefore, depending on the estimate, Nevada wagering represents between 1% and 3% of sports wagers placed by U.S. citizens.

The net result is that all states are experiencing the social impacts of sports wagering.

Only Nevada, Delaware, and Montana have any offsetting tax revenue to address such impacts and only Nevada, Delaware, and Montana have any consumer protections for sports bettors.
SPORTS WAGERING IN AMERICA

The other result is that the sports wagering industry in Nevada, Delaware, and Montana is being shaped by elected government officials, government regulatory agencies, and commercial operators or vendors that operate pursuant to strict regulation that focus on integrity, taxation, and transparent operations.

The sports wagering industry outside of Nevada, Delaware, and Montana is being shaped by those with no regard for laws, the integrity of sporting events, consumer protections, or anything else beyond operating a criminal gambling operation.

SPORTS WAGERING IN AMERICA

There are a confluence of events currently that may change the current landscape of sports wagering in America.

1. The U.S. Supreme Court agreed to hear a case regarding the constitutionality of the federal law that prevents states from legalizing and regulating sports wagering.

2. The NFL has approved putting a team in Las Vegas, the epicenter of legal sports wagering in the U.S.

3. Other sports leagues are softening their opposition with regard to sports wagering.

4. Sports wagering is losing its social stigma.
SPORTS WAGERING IN AMERICA

https://youtu.be/Ol_2QjD4eA

Adam Silver Expects Sports Gambling to Be Legalized 'In the Next Few Years'
PGA Tour hires company to monitor betting for irregularities

The PGA Tour has entered into an agreement with Lodestar-based Genius Sports to monitor wagering information worldwide for any irregular activity. The move is part of the PGA Tour's new integrity program set to launch Jan. 1, 2018.

"We felt it was important to move forward with an Integrity Program to further protect our competitors from betting-related issues," said PGA Tour commissioner Jay Monahan in a news release announcing the deal.

The PGA Tour's move is similar to other U.S.-based sports leagues who have increasingly moved into related arrangements in the gaming sector. Such moves are widely seen as helping sports governing bodies better position themselves for potential widespread legalization of sports gambling domestically.

"Preserving the integrity of sports has never been of greater importance and it requires forward thinking organizations such as the PGA Tour to proactively invest in both proven technology and education," said Genius Sports executive Mark Stover in the same release.

Genius Sports and Major League Baseball entered into a live monitoring agreement two years ago. Up-to-the-second data are used in live betting markets where customers can wager while the tournament is ongoing. Fresh live betting is extremely popular overseas and is beginning to gain a foothold in Nevada with some licensed sportsbooks now offering mobile apps for tournament betting.
Gambling Compliance (www.gamblingcompliance.com) just published a study on the U.S. Sports Betting market.

They project that if federal laws prohibiting the authorization and regulation of sports wagering fall, that it will generate about $2 billion and $5 billion dollars in gross gaming revenue.

That would translate into between $41 and $102 billion dollars in wagers placed in states that are likely to authorize and regulate sports wagering in the U.S.
OTHER KEY FEDERAL LAWS

FEDERAL WIRE ACT

ILLEGAL GAMBLING BUSINESS ACT

FEDERAL WIRE ACT

Part of the 1961 legislative package designed to cut off activities that financially sustained organized crime and to help states enforce their gambling laws.
FEDERAL WIRE ACT

• 18 USC §1084
  • (a) Whoever being engaged in the business of betting or wagering
    knowingly uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in
    interstate or foreign commerce of bets or wagers or information
    assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or
    contest, or for the transmission of a wire communication which
    entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or
    wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers,
    shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years,
    or both.
18 USC §1084
(a) Whoever being engaged in the business of betting or wagering knowingly uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or for the transmission of a wire communication which entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.
FEDERAL WIRE ACT

- 18 USC §1084
- (a) Whoever being engaged in the business of betting or wagering knowingly uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or for the transmission of a wire communication which entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.
FEDERAL WIRE ACT

- 18 USC §1084
  - (a) Whoever being engaged in the business of betting or wagering knowingly uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or for the transmission of a wire communication which entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than two years, or both.
It is a pleasure to speak to you today about some of the many issues involved with on-line gambling. Let me state at the outset that when I refer to on-line gambling, I am including within that definition gambling and gaming of all types, be it casino-type games or sporting events, and I am also including gambling by other technologies, such as through interactive television. For purposes of United States law, these distinctions are not as significant as they are under the laws of other countries.

One such statute is the so-called Wire Act, which is codified at Section 1084 of Title 18 of the United States Code. This statute makes it a crime, punishable up to two years in prison, to knowingly transmit in interstate or foreign commerce bets on any sporting event or contest. It is the Department of Justice's position that this prohibition applies to both sporting events and other forms of gambling, and that it also applies to those who send or receive bets in interstate or foreign commerce even if it is legal to place or receive such a bet in both the sending jurisdiction and the receiving jurisdiction.
It is the Department of Justice’s position that this prohibition (in reference to the Wire Act) applies to both sporting events and other forms of gambling, and that it also applies to those who send or receive bets in interstate or foreign commerce even if it is legal to place or receive such a bet in both the sending jurisdiction and the receiving jurisdiction. This view was upheld by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals in the recent successful federal prosecution of Jay Cohen, who was the President of World Sports Exchange, a company which was based in Antigua but which accepted bets via the telephone and the Internet from citizens in the United States, who was the President of World Sports Exchange, a company which was based in Antigua but which accepted bets via the telephone and the Internet from citizens in the United States.

18 USC §1084
(a) Whoever being engaged in the business of betting or wagering knowingly uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest, or for the transmission of a wire communication which entitles the recipient to receive money or credit as a result of bets or wagers, or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers, shall be fined under this
• In 2009, the New York and Illinois Lotteries sought to offer intrastate online lottery products for sale.
• Prior to engaging in the activities, both New York and Illinois lottery officials sent notice to the DOJ and a request for a response from the DOJ if the DOJ believed the activity violated federal law.
• The lotteries argued that the UIGEA’s expression of exempting intrastate transactions from the UIGEA prohibitions created a tension with the DOJ’s interpretation of the wire act. Namely, activity exempted under the UIGEA prohibitions could be deemed illegal under the DOJ interpretation of the Wire Act.

• The DOJ did not respond to the lotteries and New York and Illinois believed the silence of the DOJ was indicative of a lack of concern by the DOJ that the lottery activity violated federal law.
• Given the silence of the DOJ, New York and Illinois went forward.
In July 2011, Senator’s Reid and Kyl issued a letter to the DOJ asking the DOJ to reaffirm its position that the wire act prohibited the activities in which the New York and Illinois lotteries were engaged.
THE NEW DOJ OPINION

- On December 23, 2011, the DOJ issued an opinion in support of its letter to the state lotteries of New York and Illinois.
- In the opinion the DOJ recognized the tension identified by the lotteries and re-interpreted the wire act such that the DOJ believes the wire act only applies to SPORTS wagering.
- Thus the wire act does not apply to the activities of the lotteries.
- Thus, as it applies to the lotteries, there is no tension between the wire act and the UIGEA.
- The opinion goes on to read the sports betting limitation into the provisions that do not mention sports by stating the term betting or wagering is shorthand for “sports betting or wagering”, thus taking a different position than the court in the Lombardo opinion.
THE NEW DOJ OPINION

- The new opinion mitigates, and during the Obama administration eliminates, federal DOJ prosecutions under the wire act for activities other than sports wagering.
- It is not a green light that online wagering, other than sports wagering, is not prohibited in the U.S.
  - There are other statutes applicable to online wagering
  - Poker Stars, Full Tilt and Absolute were not charged with any federal wire act violations.

THE NEW DOJ OPINION

- What does this mean?
  - Does the opinion have the force of law?
  - Can the opinion be modified in the future?
  - Can the opinion be limited in the future?
  - Can the opinion be rescinded?
  - Can a new opinion contradict this opinion?
  - What is the net effect?
THE NEW DOJ OPINION

ILLEGAL GAMBLING BUSINESS ACT

FEDERAL LAW THAT RELIES ON STATE OFFENSE
ILLEGAL GAMBLING BUSINESS ACT

18 U.S.C. §1955 the Statute
(a) Whoever conducts, finances, manages, supervises, directs, or owns all or part of an illegal gambling business shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) As used in this section—
- (1) "illegal gambling business" means a gambling business which—
  - (i) is a violation of the law of a State or political subdivision in which it is conducted;
  - (ii) involves five or more persons who conduct, finance, manage, supervise, direct, or own all or part of such business; and
  - (iii) has been or remains in substantially continuous operation for a period in excess of thirty days or has a gross revenue of $2,000 in any single day.
ILLEGAL GAMBLING BUSINESS ACT

18 U.S.C. §1955 the Statute
(2) “gambling” includes but is not limited to pool-selling, bookmaking, maintaining slot machines, roulette wheels or dice tables, and conducting lotteries, policy, bolita or numbers games, or selling chances therein.
(3) “State” means any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

In other words, if an activity violates a state gambling law in interstate commerce, and it meets the size requirements, the state offense now is accompanied by a federal offense.
The prevailing rule is that one "conducts" a gambling business if that person performs any act, duty or function which is necessary or helpful in operating the enterprise.

An illustration of the broad interpretation of Conducts can be found in the Merrell Court Opinion (Merrell was a janitor convicted under the Illegal Gambling Business Act):

- Merrell's actions clearly aided the gambling operation involved here. By serving coffee, appellant helped the bettors to continue wagering without interruption. By cleaning up and preparing the gambling area for future sessions, appellant helped to provide an attractive place for bettors to congregate in order to wager. In light of the authorities from the fifth, seventh and eighth circuits, we hold that persons who regularly aid gambling enterprises should be subject to prosecution under section 1955 even though their conduct may not be strictly necessary to the success of such businesses.
The Illegal Gambling Business Act was the primary federal gambling crime asserted against PokerStars, Full Tilt, and Absolute Poker in the 2010 indictments of these online poker providers.
### TYPES OF WAGERS

**POINT SPREADS - OVER/UNDER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Money Line</th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Under</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1st Half</th>
<th>2nd Half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>5:15 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>8:30 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>10:00 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>10:30 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Las Vegas Line Movements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Money Line</th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Under</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1st Half</th>
<th>2nd Half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>5:15 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>8:30 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>10:00 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>10:30 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**William Hill Line Movements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Money Line</th>
<th>Over</th>
<th>Under</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1st Half</th>
<th>2nd Half</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>5:15 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>8:30 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>10:00 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>10:30 pm</td>
<td>PHI +110</td>
<td>CHI +110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPES OF WAGERS

Moneyline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Money Line</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1st Half</th>
<th>3rd In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>6:55am</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>-110</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/19</td>
<td>8:30am</td>
<td>PHD-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>PHD-100</td>
<td>PHD-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>11:23am</td>
<td>CME-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>CME-100</td>
<td>CME-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>2:23pm</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>12:03am</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Las Vegas Odds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Money Line</th>
<th>Spread</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>1st Half</th>
<th>3rd In</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/20</td>
<td>10:13am</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/21</td>
<td>10:23am</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td>PHF-100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TYPES OF WAGERS

Proposition Wagers

Types of Wagers

Parlay Cards
SPORTS BOOKS ALWAYS MAKE MONEY - COMMON MISCONCEPTION

- Sports books can, and sometimes do, lose money.
- The hold in Nevada (amount wagered less the amount paid out to winning bettors) is about 4.8%.
- Sports books are subject to federal excise taxes not applicable to most other forms of wagering.
OTHER ISSUES

26 U.S. Code § 4401 - Imposition of Tax

(a) Wagers

(1) State authorized wagers

There shall be imposed on any wager authorized under the law of the State in which accepted an excise tax equal to 0.25 percent of the amount of such wager.

(2) Unauthorized wagers

There shall be imposed on any wager not described in paragraph (1) an excise tax equal to 2 percent of the amount of such wager.

[For purposes of this chapter—

(A) Wager The term “wager” means—

(1) any wager with respect to a sports event or a contest placed with a person engaged in the business of accepting such wagers,

(2) any wager placed in a wagering pool with respect to a sports event or a contest, if such pool is conducted for profit, and

(C) any wager placed in a lottery conducted for profit. ]
QUESTIONS

I hope this has been helpful. Please let me know if you have any questions.