



**ATHLETIC COMMISSION
500 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37243
615-741-1831**

**Meeting Minutes for December 08, 2025
Davy Crockett Tower
Conference Room 1B**

The Tennessee Athletic Commission met on December 8, 2025, in the first-floor conference room of the Davy Crockett Tower in Nashville, Tennessee. The following business was transacted:

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT: Ben Grove, Brian Quinley, Corey Sippola.

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT: Rickey Goodrich

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT: Roxana Gumucio and Jesse Gentry.

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Director Gumucio called the meeting to order at 2:07 p.m. and took roll, establishing that a quorum was present.

NOTICE OF MEETING

Director Gumucio read the notice of meeting into the record as follows: "Notice of the December 8, 2025, meeting of the Athletic Commission including date, time and location has been noticed on the website since June 17, 2024; additionally, this month's agenda has been posted to the website since December 1, 2025."

Director Gumucio explained that individuals who wish to make a public comment on an item listed on the posted agenda during the scheduled public comment period will need to sign in on the provided sign-in sheet or by placing their name in the chat box online. It is requested that comments be limited to three (3) minutes out of respect for other speakers.

AGENDA

Ben Grove motioned to adopt the agenda, which was seconded by Corey Sippola. The motion passed unanimously.

SEPTEMBER MINUTES

Corey Sippola motioned to adopt the September minutes as written, which was seconded by Brian Quinley. The motion passed unanimously.

DIRECTORS REPORT

Budget Report

Director Gumucio presented the financial information through October 2025 reflecting a surplus of \$133,973. The reserve balance is \$203,374.

LEGAL

1. 2025057081

First Licensed: 11/13/2024

Expiration: 11/12/2026

Type: Ring Official

History: None.

Summary: This complaint was filed by a combatant against a ring official who refereed a professional MMA contest involving the complainant as a combatant. The complainant alleged the referee erred by ending the bout in a disqualification and stated it should have been declared a no contest.

The complainant/combatant and the respondent/ring official appear to both agree of the underlying facts: during the first round of the bout, the complainant kicked his opponent in the head while the opponent was considered grounded as he was on his knees. The parties disagree on whether this should be classified as an accidental foul or an intentional foul.

The respondent/referee responded to this complaint by stating he initially was going to end the bout as a no contest as he stated it didn't seem intentional; however, the complainant and his coaches kept talking during the timeout in a disrespectful manner, stated they believed the injured combatant was "faking" the injury, and laughed at him. The referee stated he warned the complainant and his coaches but they continued to be disrespectful. The referee stated that the complainant showed a lack of remorse for the foul, which went to the intent of it. Since the doctor stated the combatant could not continue, the referee called the fight as a disqualification.

A kick to the head of a grounded opponent is a foul. See Tennessee Rule 0145-03-.04 and the Unified Rules of Mixed Martial Arts. The referee has the discretion to determine whether a foul has occurred, whether it was intentional or accidental, and whether to penalize an individual, however, if the doctor ends the bout due to a foul, then the determination as to whether it was intentional or accidental would dictate the outcome of the bout.

Rule 0145-03-.11, Paragraph (7) states that a bout will end in disqualification if "an injury sustained during competition as a result of an intentional foul is severe enough to terminate the contest, multiple fouls have been assessed, and/or there is flagrant disregard for the rules and/or referee's commands." In this bout, the doctor determined the combatant could not continue after the foul, which met the first prong.

The complainant/combatant is correct in stating that if the foul was considered accidental, even though his opponent was not allowed to continue by the doctor, the bout would have ended in a no contest as the stoppage occurred in the first round. However, the determination as to whether the foul is accidental or intentional is within the discretion of the referee. The referee's statement that he initially believed the foul to be accidental but ruled it intentional based on the lack of remorse by the complainant is concerning, however, the respondent/referee stated that he believed it is hard to prove intent and that the lack of remorse would show the intent, which goes to how he interpreted the decision.

From watching the video, the complainant was on top of his opponent, and then the fighters exchanged positions. When his opponent was on his knees and began some ground and pound strikes to the complainant, the complainant kicks his legs straight toward the opponent and makes contact with his head, which is foul. There was no evidence the complainant did not know his opponent was grounded and his kicks were intentional strikes, apparently in an attempt to get

his opponent off of him. The complainant may not have intended to injure his opponent or could have intended to strike his opponent's torso, however, the kicks were intentionally thrown and resulted in a foul, which was within the referee's discretion to consider as accidental or intentional. Neither the Unified Rules nor state rules define when a foul is intentional or accidental, so it is a discretionary decision. As the referee determined that the foul was intentional and the doctor did not allow the opponent to continue, the determination that this was a disqualification was appropriate.

Recommendation: Close the complaint without further action to the result of the bout.

Commission Decision: Defer to the next meeting in March 2026 to review video footage.

2. 2025060341

First Licensed: 10/02/2025

Expiration: 10/01/2027

Type: Combatant

History: None.

Summary: The Complainant filed this complaint to request the results of his October 2025 MMA bout be overturned and ruled to be a win for him. The bout was ruled as a split decision for his opponent (the Respondent). It was a three-round bout with all three judges scoring the first round as 10-9 for the Complainant; the second round as two judges giving a 10-9 for the Respondent and one judge giving the Complainant a 10-9; and the final round as a 10-9 by all three judges for the Respondent. Based on these scores, the bout ended as a split decision for the Respondent. As evidenced by these scores, it was a close bout and there was no evidence of any apparent error or failure to adhere to the scoring guidelines by the judges.

Both the Complainant and Respondent provided statements regarding the bout and both claimed to have clearly won the bout while claiming they were each more aggressive than their opponent. Without any apparent errors or failures to follow the relevant rules or laws by the judges, it is not recommended to review the bout further and consider making a decision that would supersede the decision made by the judges who scored this bout.

Recommendation: Close this complaint.

Commission Decision: Ben Grove motioned to accept legal counsels' recommendation, which was seconded by Brian Quinley. The motion passed unanimously.

3. 2025060971

First Licensed: 09/18/2025

Expiration: 09/17/2027

Type: Ring Official

History: None.

Summary: The Complainant filed this complaint against the ring official who refereed his boxing bout in October 2025. The Complainant lost the bout by a unanimous decision with scores of 95-94, 95-94, and 96-93. The Complainant specifically requests the bout be overturned or changed to a no contest. The Complainant asserts that the ring official either missed fouls or gave too many warnings for observed fouls. The Complainant stated his opponent committed a headbutt that should have been called a foul, multiple low blows with only one given a warning, and a punch thrown after the bell.

The referee submitted a response to the complaint. He detailed his reasoning for giving warnings instead of deducting points and what he observed.

As it related to the headbutt, the referee stated when he observed the head clash, it appeared unintentional by either fighter and was a result of each fighter moving their head for positioning

during a period of infighting. The referee called time, had the physician assess the fighters, and determined the bout could continue. Video corroborated the referee's position and showed he appropriately used his discretion.

As it related to the low blows, the referee stated there were multiple permissible body shots against the Complainant, although some were borderline and he gave verbal warnings without stopping the action first. Then, later in the bout, the referee observed a sequence of 3 body shots with the first 2 being permissible and the third straying slightly lower. The referee did not believe it to be egregious or damaging, but he gave the other fighter a stern warning and assessed the Complainant to see if he needed a recovery period. After the Complainant stated he was able to proceed, the referee continued the bout with a warning to the other fighter. This was also corroborated by video. There was no clear visual evidence that the strike was a low blow that should have been a foul.

Finally, as it related to the strikes after the bell, the referee stated late in the bout there was a round where the opponent began a series of strikes during the 10-second clap. The referee told the fighters to heed the bell and after the bell sounded, the opponent had a punch that connected to the Complainant and glanced off of his shoulder. The referee stated it appeared to be accidental, non-damage causing, and warranted a warning since it did not result in any unfair advantage nor did it appear to be intentional or egregious. From the video, it is difficult to determine if the punch was in process when the bell rang or if the opponent truly threw the punch after the bell rang, however, it is clear it connected after the bell rang, although it does appear to be a glancing blow, as stated by the referee. The Complainant did not appear affected by it and the referee appears to have acted within his discretion.

The referee acted within his discretion to issue warnings rather than disqualify or penalize a fighter. From the review of the statements of the parties and the video, there were no apparent missed fouls that altered the outcome of this bout or gave either fighter an unfair advantage. Based on the referee acting appropriately within his discretion, it is recommended to close this complaint rather than conduct a full review.

Recommendation: Close the complaint.

Commission Decision: Ben Grove motioned to accept legal counsels' recommendation, which was seconded by Cory Sippola. The motion passed unanimously.

Rule Update

Jesse Gentry updated the commission on the status of the proposed rules. Mr. Gentry Advised the commission that two formal hearings would take place starting at 3PM.

NEW BUSINESS

Director Gumucio asked if anyone in the public, participating in person or remotely using Teams, had comments as they relate to the agenda. There were no comments provided.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no other business, a motion was made by Ben Grove to adjourn, which was seconded by Brian Quinley. The motion passed unanimously, and the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.