January 22, 2025

Judge Claudia Wilken

United States District Court

Northern District of California

Re: In re College Athlete NIL Litigation, Case No. 4:20-cv-03919-CW (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Judge Wilken,

My name is Adam Rourke. I am a Sophomore at Stanford University. I played on the Stanford football team for two seasons, from 2023 – 2024. I am submitting this objection to the "Settlement Football and Men's Basketball Class" definition in the proposed settlement of the above-referenced litigation, which limits membership only to full Grant-in-Aid ("GIA") scholarship athletes.

During the first season of my football career, Stanford was a member of the PAC-12. During my last season, Stanford was a member of the Atlantic Coast Conference. Thus, I played in a Power Five conference my entire career at Stanford.

I was offered and accepted a Preferred Walk-On ("PWO") position at Stanford. As a recruited PWO, I did not have to try out for the team. I was treated the same as any GIA player, except that I did not receive the same financial benefits as a GIA player. I was a full member of the team, subject to the same regulations and expectations as GIA players. I was held to the same athletic and academic standards as all GIA players, including full 12 months-a-year participation in all football practices, lifts, trainings, meetings, and activities.

During each of my four seasons, I was an active roster participant in Fall Camp, a time of year when the roster number is limited per NCAA Bylaw 17.11.3.1.2. I dressed for 16 games during my career, including travelling to away games during my sophomore season.

As a full member of the Stanford football team, I propose that players in my position should be added to the definition of the "Settlement Football and Men's Basketball Class." My NIL was used on broadcast television and other media. My NIL was used in the video game "College Football 24" produced by EA Sports featuring Stanford players. During my time at Stanford, I was not getting a free education like GIA players, but my NIL was used along with GIA players to promote the football team during broadcasts in the 16 games in which I dressed. I believe it is only fair and reasonable that players like myself be eligible for broadcast NIL payments and not be treated differently than GIA players, particularly when some of them may have played less on the field than I did.

It is not fair that athletic scholarship status alone determines that one player's NIL on the field is worth significant broadcast compensation, whereas the teammate alongside him in the same game is worth nothing. I request that the definition of the "Settlement Football and Men's Basketball Class" include all Power 5 athletes who actively participated and contributed to their teams. An easily verifiable measure, such as participation on a roster during Fall Camp or games played/snap count, would fairly include all athletes who contributed to the broadcast revenue.

If permitted, I would like to speak at the upcoming hearing. I am willing to appear in person or via Zoom.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam Rourke

NCAA Eligibility Center ID: 2211719823