Regulation, Prohibition, and Fantasy: the Case of FanDuel, DraftKings, and Daily Fantasy Sports in New York and Massachusetts

Zachary Shapiro*

In the second Republican presidential primary debate of 2016, a moderator asked presidential hopeful Jeb Bush about whether daily fantasy sports should be regulated by the government. While Bush responded that daily fantasy sports “has become something that needs to be looked at in terms of regulation,” New Jersey governor Chris Christie took great umbrage that a question about fantasy sports was being asked.

“Can we stop?” Christie said. “How about this? How about we get the government to do what they’re supposed to be doing: secure our borders, protect our people and support American values and American families. Enough on fantasy football. Let people play, who cares?”

* Zachary Evan Shapiro is in his third year at Harvard Law School. A native New Yorker, Zachary received his BA in Human Health and Medical Ethics from Brown University in 2009 and an MSc in Biomedicine, Bioscience, and Society in 2012 from the London School of Economics and Political Science. He continued his studies at Harvard Law School in order to pursue his interest of the intersection of law, ethics, and biomedicine. While at HLS, Zach advanced his interest in legal bioethics as a Legal Fellow at Harvard’s Multi-Regional Clinical Trials Center, where he worked on projects related to returning clinical trial results, post-trial access, and the ethics of clinical trials. He was awarded a Petrie-Flom Student Fellowship, which allowed him to continue his research into neuroimaging and criminal law. Zachary was a 2015 FASPE Law Fellow and then spent the summer working in the Department of Bioethics at the National Institutes of Health. In 2017, Zach will clerk for the Honorable Timothy B. Dyk, on the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

While many problems are more pressing than daily fantasy sports (“DFS”), it would seem that the attorney generals of quite a few states disagree with Governor Christie’s “live and let play” philosophy. Increasingly, state officials are seeking measures to prohibit or regulate the market for daily fantasy sports.

Increased scrutiny is quite a logical development. Over the last two years, DFS has grown into a multi-billion dollar industry, with millions of participants playing each week. Daily fantasy games involve different types of online contests where participants create a team of real-life players from various sports using salary cap limitations. Participants then enter these created rosters in cash tournaments to compete with other players for prizes based on how the chosen athletes perform in real-life competitions.

While many companies offer some form of daily fantasy games, the two primary market players are the New York-based FanDuel, and the Boston-based DraftKings. Both companies were established as venture capital-backed startup companies, and between them, they control 95% of the DFS market in the United States. These companies have demonstrated tremendous growth, are both valued at over a billion dollars, and show few signs of slowing down. The expansion of this industry, and the growing calls for some level of governmental regulation, have resulted in increased scrutiny of DFS in the recent months.

This note will examine the regulation and legality of daily fantasy sports in the United States. It will first provide an in-depth background of daily fantasy sports, examining the game itself, as well as the two major market players and the finances, investments, and partnerships that have allowed DFS to grow so rapidly. The next section will explore the traditional legal justifications for allowing DFS. The third section will examine evolving practical concerns related to the status of DFS. The final section will explore specific states actions connected with DFS, using the states of New York and Massachusetts to explore the growing movement to prohibit or regulate DFS.

I. What Is DFS?

There are several main disciplines of daily fantasy sports competitions, divided into two primary categories: cash games and tournaments with guaranteed prize pools. Individuals participate by creating an account on one of various sites, depositing money into the account, and using the money to buy entry tickets to a variety of DFS contests. DFS contests utilize a salary cap format. Participants select athletes to fill their rosters, with each user allocated a fixed maximum budget to spend on athletes for their team. Each athlete has his own cost, with elite athletes having the highest price. Teams gain points depending on the performance of the chosen athlete in real contests, similar to how scoring works for weekly fantasy sports.

There are a variety of games within DFS, and players can choose to participate in a multitude of contest formats. In “Double-up” or “50/50” cash game competitions, as well as variations such as Triple-up and Quadrupe-up, participants aim to finish with a point total inside the top 50% of those who entered the particular contest. Players who finish in the top half of the field receive a prize equal to double the entry fee, while the remainder loses their entry fee. Head-to-head competitions pit players against a single opponent, with the highest point team winning the prize. Guaranteed prize pool contests tend to have higher stakes and employ tiered payouts based on the percentile in which one finishes. Users can pay as little as $0.25 on
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4 DFS sites run a variety of promotions, encouraging users to deposit more money on their site with a promise of “matching funds.”


6 Players receive “fantasy points” for accumulating stats such as yards gained, points scored, number of catches, number of touchdowns, number of runs batted in, etc. See Michael Nelson, How to make a killer daily fantasy sports roster on DraftKings and FanDuel, VentureBeat (September 10, 2015), http://venturebeat.com/2015/09/10/how-to-make-a-killer-daily-fantasy-sports-football-roster-on-draftkings-and-fanduel/ [https://perma.cc/BYQ2-YPXZ].

DraftKings and $1 on FanDuel to play their games, and both websites offer games with entry fees of up to $10,600 for significantly larger payouts.

II. THE DAILY Fantasy Sports Industry

DFS is a recent phenomenon and has grown extremely rapidly. One of the first sites to offer daily fantasy was Instant Fantasy Sports, established in 2007. The service’s co-founder explained that the game was inspired by the format of online poker, with the goal being to take “the time frame of season-long fantasy sports leagues and shrink it.”

Gambling on sports is highly prevalent, with estimates that Americans spent over 95 billion dollars (much of it illegal) wagering on professional and college football in 2015. Traditional, season-long fantasy sports users (such as standard ESPN Fantasy Football leagues) have grown at an estimated 25% rate since 2011, with The Fantasy Sports Trade Association detailing that an estimated 57 million individuals played fantasy sports in the United States and Canada in 2015. These numbers reveal the market potential for DFS, and Eilers Research CEO Todd Eilers estimated “daily games will generate around $2.6 billion in entry fees [in 2015] and grow 41% annually, reaching $14.4 billion in 2020.”

This tremendous growth has spurred investors eager to capitalize on the developing market. Venture capitalists and media companies have made significant investments in FanDuel and DraftKings, investing well over $300 million into each company over the last year. FanDuel raised $361 million from media conglomerates such as NBC Sports, Time Warner, and
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Comcast Ventures. Rival DraftKings has kept pace, raising over $375 million, including a $300 million investment by Fox Sports.

These groups are not the only companies partnering with or investing in DFS. Increasingly, professional sports leagues have found themselves doing the same. This is a significant development, as professional leagues have long been skeptical of variations on their games that involve gambling. However, it seems that the league’s desire to drive eyes toward their games (even matchups without the luster of star players implicate fantasy matchups) has helped lead to increased interest in DFS companies. DraftKings’ last investment round included investment from ESPN, Major League Soccer, the National Hockey League, the Kraft Group—owned by Robert Kraft of the New England Patriots—and Legends Hospitality, a stadium concession business owned by the New York Yankees and the Dallas Cowboys.

In 2013, DraftKings and Major League Baseball agreed on a multiyear partnership deal, allowing DraftKings to offer co-branded MLB daily fantasy games. This agreement has led the companies to offer market-specific ballpark experiences, meaning that DFS is slowly becoming a formal part of the “normal fan experience.” Following MLB’s lead, in 2014, FanDuel announced an exclusive partnership with the NBA in exchange for an equity stake.

With this growth of players and investment, DraftKings and FanDuel have become extremely valuable companies. DraftKings has an estimated valuation of $1.2 billion, posting revenues from 2014 of $30 million. FanDuel has a slightly higher valuation, pricing at roughly $1.3 billion after
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collecting $57 million in revenues in 2014.\textsuperscript{18} Adding to their allure, fantasy sports companies have proven to be highly profitable, with margins greater than 37%.\textsuperscript{19}

The growth of DFS has been precipitated by a massive media blitz by both DraftKings and FanDuel. In the first week of the NFL regular season, DraftKings spent more on television advertising than any other company in the United States.\textsuperscript{20} In fact, according to Nomura analyst Anthony DiClemente, DraftKings and FanDuel spent more than $150 million on TV and internet advertising in the quarter that included the beginning of the football season.\textsuperscript{21}

It is not just effective advertising and smart partnerships that have allowed DFS to become so successful. Indeed, those who examine DFS credit its success to a range of factors, from the convenience of the format in comparison to season-length fantasy sports to the allure of large cash prizes (some contests advertise cash prizes of up to $1 million), as well as the ready adaptability of DFS formats to mobile devices.\textsuperscript{22} Authors have pointed out that part of the reason DFS was able to spread so quickly is that it harnessed the communal enjoyment aspect that is so crucial to the popularity of season-long fantasy leagues.\textsuperscript{23} The structure and payouts of daily fantasy games have been designed in order to provide a feeling of “instant gratification” to

\textsuperscript{21} See Myles Udland, Fantasy sports companies spend so much on commercials they’re moving the needle on TV ad spending, BUSINESS INSIDER (October 6, 2015), http://www.businessinsider.com/draftkings-fanduel-daily-fantasy-sports-advertising-2015-10 [https://perma.cc/2ECM-Y27U].
\textsuperscript{23} See Mike Butcher, FanDuel turns fantasy sports betting into a social game, TECHCRUNCH (July 21, 2009), http://techcrunch.com/2009/07/21/fanduel-turns-fantasy-sports-betting-into-a-social-game/ [https://perma.cc/XB7V-SQGY].
players similar to that of traditional sports gambling and online poker. Indeed, many players gain a great deal of personal satisfaction from engaging in DFS, as evidenced by the groundswell of support that DFS has received after efforts to regulate or prohibit it.

III. Legal Issues

While DFS initially flew under the radar, as the industry has grown, the sites offering daily fantasy games have continued to operate in a space of questionable legality. At first glance, it appeared that DFS activities were exempted from traditional regulation of internet gambling, as they seemed to fit into an exception carved out by the Unlawful Internet Gambling Enforcement Act of 2006 (UIGEA). This act was added as Title VIII to the SAFE Port Act, which otherwise regulated America’s harbor and port security. UIGEA “prohibits gambling businesses from knowingly accepting payments in connection with the participation of another person in a bet or wager that involves the use of the Internet and that is unlawful under any federal or state law.” The act specifically excluded fantasy sports that met particular requirements as well as skill-based games and legal intrastate and inter-tribal gaming.

The act was largely considered to be a response to a 2002 United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit ruling that the Federal Wire Act did not prohibit internet gambling on a game of chance. Federal regulation was helpful due to the online nature of many gambling businesses making it difficult for states to muster effective responses. The act contains specific language exempting traditional fantasy sports from regulation. The statute,
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31 U.S.C.A. § 5362, exempted participation in any fantasy or simulation sports game or educational game or contest in which (if the game or contest involves a team or teams) no fantasy or simulation sports team is based on the current membership of an actual team that is a member of an amateur or professional sports organization (as those terms are defined in section 3701 of title 28) and that meets the following conditions: (i) all prizes and awards offered to winning participants are established and made known to the participants in advance of the game or contest and their value is not determined by the number of participants or the amount of fees paid by those participants. (ii) all winning outcomes reflect the relative knowledge and skill of the participants and are determined predominantly by accumulated statistical results of the performance of individuals (athletes in the case of sports events) in multiple real-world sporting or other events, and (iii) no winning outcome is based solely on any single performance of an individual athlete in any single real-world sporting or other event.30

While DFS sites have pointed to this regulation to argue that they are legal, when the act passed, DFS was not being widely played or marketed to players. Indeed, it is unclear whether DFS even existed at this time. There is no evidence that legislators or drafters considered DFS, and it is only clear that the Act intended to exempt traditional, season-long, fantasy sports. Indeed, legal scholars writing about fantasy sports and UIGEA did not even mention daily fantasy sports.31

Despite this, DFS sites have pointed to the fantasy exception carved out by UIGEA as proof positive that their offerings are legal and aboveboard. Under these auspices, DFS has steadily grown, with few genuine challenges. Given the online nature of the games, it has been difficult to enforce state regulation of DFS. However, as DFS became increasingly popular, scrutiny ratcheted up, and state regulators began to take notice. Because “federal gambling laws . . . only facilitate the enforcement of state gambling laws,”32 the ultimate determinations of legality for DFS will rest with individual states.

---

32 Id.
A. Skill or Chance?

The distinction between games of skill and chance is often highlighted as a key feature determining whether or not a particular activity should be considered gambling or legal activity and is advanced by DFS companies as a key reason why their games are legal. State laws traditionally apply varying standards when determining whether a game is one of skill or of chance. Most base their determinations on whether the chance-based elements are predominant over the skill-based ones and on whether chance has more than an incidental impact on the outcome of the game. This determination is crucial, as many states allow people to pay money to participate in games of skill but forbid them from paying to enter games of chance.

Of course, most games have elements of both skill and chance, meaning that whether a given game is considered a game of chance or a game of skill will often depend on a subjective determination of which element is the dominant factor in the outcome. This highlights a major weakness of the skill vs. chance determination, as different individuals may arrive at vastly different conclusions. Traditional hallmarks of games of skill include learned or developed ability, identifiable strategy or tactics that result in positive outcomes, and technical expertise. These factors combine to make it legal to bet on several games of skill. Some of the most common examples include certain card games such as gin rummy, pool, darts, and season-long fantasy sports leagues.

Opponents have argued that because athlete performance varies on a week-to-week basis, DFS contests involve little more than wagering on the performance of individual athletes during a given game. This is crucially different from traditional fantasy sports, which involves managing a team on a week-to-week basis across a season. This distinction is mobilized to argue that DFS ultimately relies on chance.
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In response, advocates have argued that preparing a daily fantasy team requires skill, as creating a successful team requires extensive knowledge. Players must not only be familiar with the sport, the individual players, and their respective performances, but they must possess the ability to utilize this knowledge to construct a team of top-performing players within the limitation of a salary cap. The data does seem to bolster the argument that DFS is a game of skill. One study by McKinsey & Company examined the first half of the 2015 MLB season. The study estimated that 91% of winnings were won by only 1.3% of players. This is far from the normal distribution that would be expected from a game whose outcome relies purely on chance. It is also clear that inexperienced players can be at a disadvantage due to the skill of their opponents.

Exact determinations of whether DFS is a game of skill or chance will ultimately rest on state law interpretations of these terms. This adds another wrinkle to determinations of the legality of DFS, as different states will interpret provisions differently, leading to variable outcomes. Indeed, the difficulty of determining whether a game is one of skill or chance is evident from the cases of poker, horse racing, sweepstakes, and even carnival games.

To illustrate this problem, one can examine the question of whether DFS is a game of skill or chance under New York law. New York defines “contest of chance” to mean "any contest, game, gaming scheme or gaming device in which the outcome depends in a material degree upon an element of chance, notwithstanding that skill of the contestants may also be a factor
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therein” (emphasis added).\(^{44}\) New York Penal Law 225.00 defines gambling as when a person “stakes or risks something of value upon the outcome of a contest of chance or a future contingent event not under his control or influence” (emphasis added).\(^{45}\)

Thus, one can see that, under New York law, DFS could be a game of skill yet still be classified as gambling if Courts decide that the outcome of DFS games is determined by a “material degree of chance.” New York courts have no recent rulings defining exactly what level of chance would be considered material, but experts suggest that the court may choose to follow one of two opposing precedents.\(^{46}\) Some highlight a decision from Missouri, where a court ruled that chance can be material without being the dominant element even when a game is more than 50% skill-based.\(^{47}\) Alternatively, a New York case from the early 20th century required a *material degree of chance* to be the dominant element, meaning chance must be the controlling factor in a game.\(^{48}\)

While the determination made by the New York state court will be discussed below, it is clear that there is no “slam-dunk” legal answer to whether DFS is a game of skill or chance, even when we examine the law of just one state. This illustrates the difficulty of regulating DFS state by state; such a process will result in a long period of uncertainty as many legal issues work their way through the courts and appellate procedures. Given that there is no clear answer for whether DFS should be considered a game of skill, chance, or a game of skill that nonetheless relies on a “material degree of chance,” it is clear that the ultimate determination of legality under New York law is a difficult and subjective one.\(^{49}\) Indeed, it is predictable that different courts might find different answers when examining this issue. Given that this determination is highly subjective and fact-specific, DFS continues to operate in a “grey area” of legality, lacking any clear legislative guidance on this issue.

\(^{44}\) N.Y. Penal Law § 225.00 (McKinney); 35C N.Y. Jur. 2d Criminal Law: Principles and Offenses § 1744.

\(^{45}\) Id.


\(^{47}\) See *Thole v. Westfall*, 682 S.W.2d 33, 37, n. 8 (Mo. Ct. App. 1984) (holding that to satisfy Missouri’s material element test, “chance must be a material element in determining the outcome,” but “need not be the dominant element”).

\(^{48}\) *People ex rel. Ellison v. Lavin*, 71 N.E. 753, 754 (N.Y. 1904) (holding that a lottery need not be determined exclusively by chance to be considered gambling).

\(^{49}\) For another look at this difficulty, see Hammon, supra note 49.
IV. Reasons to Regulate

Beyond legal arguments, opponents point to several normative justifications for why DFS should face some level of regulation.

A. Addictive Potential

Recently, researchers have begun to examine DFS through a public health lens due to fears that games like DFS can exacerbate gambling addiction.\(^{50}\) Indeed, in the cease and desist letter that Attorney General (AG) Eric Schneiderman of New York sent to DraftKings and FanDuel, he specifically highlighted that “[d]aily Fantasy Sports are creating the same public health and economic concerns as other forms of gambling.”\(^{51}\)

Of particular concern is the fact that fantasy games primarily appeal to the demographic that researchers identify as most likely to develop gambling problems—young men. Research confirms that this same demographic is most likely to engage in high-risk behaviors\(^ {52}\) and is most vulnerable to developing problems with gambling.\(^ {53}\) Indeed, neuroscientific evidence supports that young men are at highest risk for developing improper neural reward pathways\(^ {54}\) which tend to result in addiction.\(^ {55}\) Furthermore, recent research suggests that gambling addiction has a high prevalence of harmful comorbidities, such as substance abuse disorders and other mental health problems, indicating that easy access to gambling can have untold negative effects on those most susceptible.\(^ {56}\) FanDuel readily admits that it targets millennials, and psychologists who analyze DFS advertisements highlight that the psychological mechanisms employed are particularly effective at

\(^{50}\) See Feinman, supra note 28.


\(^{54}\) See Peter Putman et al., Exogenous cortisol acutely influences motivated decision making in healthy young men, 208 Psychopharmacology 257, 260 (2010).


persuading young men.\textsuperscript{57} Indeed, the barrage of advertising has proven to be extremely effective.

There are already numerous stories of DFS exacerbating problems, or acting as a damaging enabling outlet, for those with serious gambling problems.\textsuperscript{58} Stories of players racking up extremely high levels of debt are commonplace.\textsuperscript{59} Furthermore, DFS companies have not been proactive in addressing the concerns related to gambling addiction. Indeed, neither FanDuel nor DraftKings mentions 1-800-GAMBLER, one of the most well regarded support hotlines for those suffering with gambling problems, on its website. While the sites include links to the National Center for Responsible Gaming, this group has come under fire recently for being funded, in part, by the casino industry.

\textbf{B. Company Abuse and Practices}

Beyond the nature of DFS games themselves, company practices at DraftKings and FanDuel have led to increased scrutiny and criticism of the industry.\textsuperscript{60} A major scandal for DFS erupted when an employee at DraftKings admitted to inadvertently releasing data before the start of the third week of N.F.L. games.\textsuperscript{61} It was discovered that this employee, a midlevel content manager, won $350,000 at FanDuel that same week. This raised legitimate fears of a form of “insider trading,” where employees at DFS companies could muster the knowledge they gained from employment to gain a competitive advantage in contests on competing sites. In many ways, DFS is akin to a form of day trading on athletes, so concerns related to insider trading are particularly salient.

While employees have always been banned from playing on their own website, this episode raised serious questions about which employees at daily
fantasy companies have access to valuable proprietary data and how these employees are using this information. This data, including which players a majority of the money is being bet on, can offer significant advantages if utilized properly, because top prizes are often won by individuals with players who appear on fewer rosters in a given tournament. It should be noted that the fact that insiders are able to muster information to gain an advantage speaks against the notion that DFS is purely a game of chance.

After the discovery of the conduct of their employees, both DraftKings and FanDuel have been named in class-action lawsuits. The companies are accused of fraud, negligence, and false advertising.


63 Johnson began by depositing $100 into a DraftKings account.


their employees were playing on rival sites and did not take action to prevent it.\textsuperscript{68} Controversy has continued as media outlets focusing on DFS “success stories” (players who win large sums of money) have found that major winners are few and far between.\textsuperscript{69} Additionally, as FanDuel and DraftKings have been forced to argue that DFS is a game of skill, their advertising, which depicts even inexperienced players as having a good chance of winning, has come under increased scrutiny.\textsuperscript{70}

V. STATE RESPONSES

While DFS sites have pointed to the UIGEA as providing legal protection for DFS games, states have begun to increasingly seek actions to prohibit or regulate DFS. UIGEA does not prohibit states from deciding to regulate fantasy games, and recently Congressman Jim Leach, one of the authors of the UIGEA, explained that the fantasy sports carve-out was not intended to cover the present-day daily fantasy industry. The Congressman claimed, “it is sheer chutzpah for a fantasy sports company to cite the law as a legal basis for existing.”\textsuperscript{71} DFS has long operated on a state-by-state model due to the uncertain legality of DFS under state gambling laws. For instance, daily fantasy services have made residents of Arizona, Iowa, Louisiana, Montana, and Washington ineligible for participation.\textsuperscript{72}

A more interesting area for examination is to look at states that are currently deciding whether and how to regulate DFS. By examining two


\textsuperscript{71} See Tim Dahlberg, Author of anti-gambling law says “sheer chutzpah” for daily fantasy sites to claim legitimacy, USNews (October 12, 2015), http://www.usnews.com/news/sports/articles/2015/10/12/former-congressman-says-dfs-is-cauldron-of-daily-betting [https://perma.cc/D592-8F82].

different models for regulation proposed by New York and Massachusetts, one can begin to understand the complexities and challenges of any scheme to reign in DFS. These two states were chosen due to the large size of their DFS markets, the fact that the companies are themselves based in New York (FanDuel) and Massachusetts (DraftKings), and the fact that the state responses have been very different.

A. New York

New York has taken an extremely aggressive approach to DFS, with Schneiderman issuing a cease-and-desist order to DraftKings and FanDuel on November 10th, 2015. The AG argued that DFS was illegal under state law, as players were risking “something of value” on a contest where they did not have “control or influence” over the outcome. Invoking New York penal law, Schneiderman contended that winning or losing in DFS depends on numerous elements of chance to a “material degree” and characterized the DFS industry as being a “massive, multi-billion-dollar scheme intended to evade the law and fleece sports fans across the country.”

Schneiderman’s letter set off a firestorm of controversy. In response, DraftKings and FanDuel filed lawsuits against the state of New York, alleging that DFS was a game of skill and that the AG had denied the companies due processes by overstepping his power. Both companies further alleged that Schneiderman had engaged in tortious interference by sending cease and desist notices to payment processors. In response, a few days later, the AG filed a request for a temporary injunction to force DraftKings and FanDuel to halt service for players in New York. Schneiderman reiterated his argument that DFS was simply a “re-branding” of sports gambling,
while also bringing up the insider trading scandal in accusing the two companies of “basic compliance issues.”

During hearings held on November 25, 2015, Judge Manuel J. Mendoza of the New York Supreme Court was skeptical of assertions by DFS companies that a player’s choice of athletes represents “control or influence” over the outcome. The Judge stated that players are ultimately “relying on someone else’s skill” to determine the outcome. On December 11, 2015, Mendoza sided with Schneiderman and granted a temporary injunction forbidding DraftKings and FanDuel from “accepting entry fees, wagers or bets” from residents of the state of New York. While holding that UIGEA has “no corresponding authority under New York State law,” Mendoza highlighted that payment of an ‘entry fee’ as high as $10,600 could “certainly be deemed risking ‘something of value.’” This ruling seemed to set aside the question of skill or chance, as Mendoza pointed out that even if DFS was a game of skill, it could still meet the requirements for prohibition under NY law.

Despite the ruling, Mendoza granted a temporary stay, confirmed by the appellate court, pending adjudication on appeal. Prior to the appellate hearing, on January 4, 2016, Schneiderman amended the lawsuit to demand that the two companies pay restitution of over $4 billion, which includes returning of all money collected from customers in New York State. Schneiderman alleged that this restitution was justified in part by the two companies’ deceptive advertising practices. Pending an appeals court ruling, DFS continues to operate in New York. Given the legal uncertainty,
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there has been a renewed push for a legislative response to DFS, and State Senator Michael Ranzenhofer has introduced a bill that would end the legal drama by explicitly classifying daily fantasy sports as a game of skill.

B. Massachusetts

Another state that has begun to scrutinize DFS is Massachusetts, where Massachusetts AG Maura Healey proposed a new set of regulations for daily fantasy operators. Rather than make DFS illegal, as Schneiderman wants to do, Healey proposes regulating the industry closely using a consumer protection framework. Healey has said that daily fantasy sports businesses are legal in the state but still constitute gambling.

Healey’s proposal is outlined in 940 C.M.R. 34.00: Daily Fantasy Sports Contest Operators in Massachusetts. The purpose of the regulation is to “protect Massachusetts consumers who play Daily Fantasy Sports contests for prizes from unfair and deceptive acts and practices that may arise in the gaming process.” The regulation is also intended to “protect the families of persons who play Daily Fantasy Sports to the extent that they may be affected by unfair and deceptive practices that lead to unaffordable losses.” Healey’s full list contains 14 bullet-point rules in four sections that range from “protecting minors” and “leveling the playing field” to “advertising and marketing” and “financial protections.”

The proposed regulations include measures that would not allow a DFS player to establish more than one username or more than one account. A rule like this, properly enforced, could help prevent some of the gambling binges that present the greatest danger to addicts.88 The regulations also include a section specifically on truthful advertising and a requirement that ads include information regarding assistance available to problem gamblers.89 Another element of the proposal is that playing be restricted to ages 21 and older and that users be limited to depositing $1,000 a month.

Indeed, the protection of minors is a theme that runs throughout Healey’s proposal, which also wants to ban the companies from marketing on college campuses, a position that has already gained momentum in other corners. The SEC Network, one of ESPN’s channels, decided to stop running DraftKings and FanDuel ads.90 Recently, ESPN and College Football Playoff officials agreed that there will be no advertising for daily fantasy games during the telecasts of the national semifinals or the national championship game.91

While these proposed rules would arguably hamper revenues for daily fantasy companies in Massachusetts, both DraftKings and FanDuel quickly voiced support for Healey’s plan. Their receptiveness has most likely been tied to the fact that Healey’s proposal of regulation is clearly much friendlier than Schneiderman’s proposal in New York. Indeed, DraftKings called the proposal “a thoughtful and comprehensive approach,” while FanDuel argued that it made “a tremendous amount of sense.” Healey’s office cannot implement the new regulations immediately, but must accept public comments through January before making a final proposal.92 Thanks to the pub-

lic comment period, the process will play out under a microscope, and hearings on DFS have already begun.

The examples of New York and Massachusetts provide an interesting window into how states can begin to deal with the reality of DFS. Of course these are not the only two models, as actions concerning DFS have accelerated in a number of states. For instance, in Nevada, where licensed gambling is legal, regulators ruled that DFS constitutes a form of gambling and is not a game of skill. State officials ordered DraftKings and FanDuel to stop operating immediately in the state until the companies and their employees receive state gambling licenses. Others highlight Illinois as the next battleground state after a court recently advised that DFS is illegal.93

VI. Conclusion

The examples of Massachusetts and New York highlight that challenges to the standard operating practices of DFS will continue until the legal gray areas of DFS are clarified. If the industry of DFS is to survive, companies should strive to work with regulators rather than oppose them. Working with regulators to address legitimate concerns about public health and company practices will allow these companies to better avoid the wholesale prohibition advocated by some of the staunchest opponents. This begs the important question of whether DFS companies will be proactive and begin making changes to appease regulatory bodies, or whether they will put their efforts towards resisting legal intervention.

At the same time, regulators should view DFS as a potential opportunity. DFS has clearly struck a cord with consumers and fans, and there is no reason that it cannot continue, as long as responsible and common sense changes are made to ameliorate the legitimate concerns. For example, Massachusetts and Texas recently explored bills examining the possibility of allowing the lottery to run online, skill-based games, such as daily fantasy sports.94

Most importantly, this is an issue that requires legislative guidance. DFS is not similar enough to traditional fantasy or gambling games to be considered by a group of inexpert judges under the existing rubric of gam-

bling laws written well before the invention of DFS. Rather, this issue demands careful study and fact finding so that the scope of the problem and the true dimensions of DFS can be properly debated and discussed. These are clearly tasks that are best suited to the legislative branch, and there are already numerous examples of legislators introducing bills to prohibit, or allow, DFS.

There are signs that a sea change is coming for daily fantasy sports. In late March, FanDuel and DraftKings agreed to halt their business in New York, putting their hopes on a legislative avenue to make DFS legal. In contrast, in Massachusetts, the push for regulation continues, and the AG is expected to issue formal rules governing DFS in early April. These contrasting state models do not just serve as a lesson to DFS companies but should highlight the need for proper legislative guidance on this sensitive issue. Legislative guidance will allow the will of the people of each state to decide whether DFS is right for their particular circumstances while considering the perspective of diverse stakeholders. It will also enable common sense regulation in order to ameliorate the legitimate problems and concerns related to widespread access to DFS.