



March 18, 2026

Testimony of Ian Lee

Senior Policy Director, Western States, Ticket Policy Forum

Before the Minnesota State House Committee on Commerce Finance and Policy

Re: HF 4250

Position: Opposed

Co-Chairs, and Co-Vice Chairs, and Members of the Committee:

My name is Ian Lee, and I represent the [Ticket Policy Forum](#) (TPF). Thank you for the opportunity to testify regarding HF 4250.

The Ticket Policy Forum represents America's leading and most trusted online ticket marketplaces, including StubHub, SeatGeek, Vivid Seats, TickPick, Gametime, and Events Ticket Center. Our member companies serve tens of millions of fans every year by providing secure, guaranteed transactions, fraud prevention, and customer support that protect buyers and sellers.

We appreciate that HF 4250 is designed to protect fans. Just two years ago, Minnesota enacted one of the most comprehensive ticketing consumer protection frameworks in the country. The Legislature addressed the core problems consumers face when buying tickets:

- Hidden fees and lack of transparency
- Deceptive speculative listings
- Illegal use of bots
- Misleading and deceptive websites and marketing
- Lack of refund and purchase information

As a result, strong transparency and anti-fraud protections are already in place, and the current legislative debate centers primarily on proposals to impose government price caps on resale tickets, rather than filling gaps in consumer protection.

HF 4250 would have serious unintended compliance problems and enforcement consequences therefore we respectfully oppose this bill.

I. PRICE CAPS SOUND SIMPLE BUT FAIL IN PRACTICE

Price controls do not eliminate demand for high-demand events. They distort markets, reduce transparency, and push transactions into unregulated channels. When resale is artificially restricted on our safe marketplaces, transactions don't stop, they move to less safe spaces where fraud and scams are more common.



Legitimate marketplaces have spent more than two decades moving ticket resale off street corners and out of risky online forums and into regulated e-commerce platforms with guarantees, identity verification, secure payments, and refund protections. There is simply no reason for Minnesota fans to be pushed back toward cash meetups and shadow markets, yet that is the predictable outcome when safe resale is restricted.

II. MARKETPLACES CANNOT VERIFY “ORIGINAL PURCHASE PRICE”

HF 4250’s price cap structure assumes that a resale marketplace can reliably determine the original purchase price of each ticket. Marketplaces often cannot verify the original cost of tickets across systems, namely because Ticketmaster does not provide interoperability that would make this possible for digital tickets, making compliance with HF 4250 technically impossible. In many cases, the only way a ticket can be transferred is through proprietary technology systems that do not disclose the original purchase price or the underlying fee structure to third parties.

This creates a major compliance dilemma:

- Resale marketplaces do not have access to the true original ticket price.
- Marketplaces cannot independently verify the original “face value” or original all-in purchase price.
- The marketplace is forced to rely on seller-provided information.
- Without cooperation from the dominant primary ticketing platform, which it has no incentive to provide, compliance becomes guesswork.

When legislation imposes a price cap without requiring primary ticketing interoperability, it effectively places secondary marketplaces in an impossible position: comply with a rule that cannot be reliably measured, audited, or enforced.

III. THE BILL WILL PUSH RESALE INTO LESS SAFE CHANNELS

Because demand cannot be legislatively regulated, the predictable consequence of price caps is displacement. If a fan in Minnesota wants to buy a ticket to a sold-out event and cannot find it on a safe, guaranteed marketplace due to the bill’s restrictions, they will not simply stop trying. They will turn to other channels, including:

- Social media meetups and Facebook groups
- Informal online marketplaces
- Unregulated peer-to-peer transactions
- Cash-based exchanges outside venues
- Encrypted chats and private group message boards

These are precisely the environments where scams, counterfeit tickets, and consumer harm thrive.



In markets that have implemented resale price controls, such as Ireland and certain Australian jurisdictions, research shows reports of ticket-related fraud increased significantly (four times higher), scam-related consumer losses rose sharply, and authorities identified hundreds of fraudulent ticket resale websites. In fact in test purchases responding to ticket offers on social media sites, an [investigative firm](#) found that fans were scammed half of the time. In Ireland, digital bank Revolut, which serves more than 3 million customers, reported a 48% rise in scam-related financial losses and an [80% increase in ticket scam victims](#). In France, a face-value price cap contributed to a surge of Olympics-related scams. A dedicated unit of the National Gendarmerie identified [338 fraudulent ticket websites](#) but was able to shut down only 51.

These outcomes illustrate that when legitimate platforms are restricted, buyers and sellers don't disappear. Instead, fraud rises and consumer protections vanish.

Unlike legitimate marketplaces, these channels typically offer:

- No identity verification
- No secure payment processing
- No fraud detection systems
- No guarantees
- No customer support
- No meaningful recourse for victims

It is also important to recognize the broader momentum in state policymaking on this issue. While resale price caps have been introduced in recent years, many legislatures walk away from them once they examine the compliance realities and consumer consequences. Massachusetts, for example, recently repealed its resale price cap after concluding it was unworkable. This year New Mexico, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Washington State, and Wisconsin abandoned resale cap proposals after further review.

IV. THE BILL CREATES AN UNEVEN AND UNFAIR STANDARD

Some may suggest this legislation will bring down the cost of tickets. It will not. In fact, given it would regulate only previously purchased tickets, the bill does nothing to prevent ticket prices at the box office or on Ticketmaster from skyrocketing. By neglecting so-called "primary ticket sales" at the box office or through the venue's contracted ticketing firm, which is most often Ticketmaster, primary ticket prices would still adjust upwards with no restriction regardless of a new law.

In other words, the box office can legally raise prices in real time through dynamic pricing or other means, but a ticket holder who already purchased a ticket is prohibited from setting a price based on that same demand. For example, regardless of this legislation, one seat might cost \$100 on Ticketmaster and the seat next to it might jump to \$1,000 just a few minutes later.



This approach is inequitable and does not address the root causes of high ticket prices. Instead, it could empower box offices to monopolistically raise prices as high as desired.

The recent leak of [internal Ticketmaster communications](#) demonstrates the monopoly's commitment to arbitrarily raising prices and taking advantage of fans, even going so far as to say they're "robbing them blind."

Maintaining the ability for consumers to comparison shop across multiple ticket sellers is important as it provides an important competitive check to box offices. As of Monday evening for example, tonight's Jazz at Timberwolves game was offered at under \$100 per ticket on Vivid Seats – whereas the box office price was \$146. The same is the case for the Bruce Springsteen show, in which Tick Pick has tickets offered at \$77 for a ticket and the box office price is currently \$102. Fans can often get better deals on the secondary marketplace. But this bill would make that harder for fans to enjoy.

CONCLUSION

We respectfully oppose HF 4250.

While we appreciate the intent of the bill, we do not believe it is necessary given Minnesota already passed and enacted a strong set of consumer protections just two years ago. Further, driving consumers toward unsafe channels for ticket buying and selling is a serious consequence that would result from the proposed price controls and therefore should be avoided.

The Ticket Policy Forum stands ready to work with the Committee and the Legislature on more effective consumer protection solutions that preserve safe, transparent ticket resale and promote real competition in ticketing.

Respectfully submitted,
Ian Lee
Ticket Policy Forum
www.TicketPolicyForum.org