



Baseball's cap debate: why player lockout risk is rising, and why private capital is watching

June 2026

Major League Baseball (MLB) has revived salary cap discussions in its ongoing negotiations with the Major League Baseball Players Association (MLBPA), raising the prospect of a labor dispute as the current collective bargaining agreement (CBA) approaches its December 1, 2026 expiration. The 1994–95 labor dispute, which forced the cancellation of the World Series, serves as a stark reminder that when the game stops, baseball's economics come under immediate strain. If the current talks break down, private equity sponsors will be well positioned to come out of the bullpen.

In this briefing, we explore the commercial implications of MLB's current collective bargaining proposal, the operational and liquidity pressures a player lockout would create for clubs, and what this cycle may mean for private capital.

Key issues

- 1 MLB's economic structure may be on the verge of significant transformation
- 2 The cap proposal reflects fundamentally opposing views between owners and players the risk of a more entrenched bargaining posture on both sides
- 3 A player lockout would create immediate revenue and liquidity pressure for clubs
- 4 The private capital angle is more salient because MLB now permits institutional minority investment

Baseball's economic model faces a real inflection point

MLB has long been the outlier among the major US professional sports leagues. While the NFL, NBA, NHL and MLS each operate with some form of salary cap or payroll constraint, baseball has continued to preserve an uncapped labor market, with the Competitive Balance Tax (CBT, commonly referred to as the "luxury tax") serving as its principal restraint on club payrolls.

In practice, the CBT has produced a wide variation in club behavior. Some clubs operate well below the luxury tax threshold, while others treat the tax as a cost of winning and maintaining a club's brand. That divergence has contributed to an uneven economic model across the league and, even more so, led to a lack of competitive parity.

On May 28, 2026, MLB owners formally introduced a cap-and-floor system in the current CBA negotiations with the MLBPA. The headline figures, a \$245 million salary cap and a \$171 million floor, are less important than the underlying shift in philosophy. At its core, the proposal seeks to compress payroll disparities, mandate a baseline level of annual investment in rosters, and recalibrate revenue-sharing to bolster economics across all markets. The league's objective is to make baseball a more competitive and marketable national product, thereby enhancing the value of its media rights. The MLBPA, unsurprisingly, sees it differently: not as a fix for competitive imbalance, but as a mechanism to impose greater cost certainty on owners.

Why this cycle is different

With the current CBA approaching expiration, the central question is not whether MLB will face labor disruption, but how disruptive it will be and how quickly it will impact the business of the sport. Prior lockouts have shown how quickly a CBA deadline can cascade into operational strain for clubs, players, broadcasters and commercial partners, while also eroding fan goodwill.

From an ownership perspective, missed games would translate into immediate revenue leakage across ticketing, premium experiences, concessions, sponsorship activation, merchandising and media rights. A prolonged interruption would place additional pressure on ownership groups that are simultaneously funding stadium-adjacent developments, real estate projects and other capital-intensive initiatives, raising the risk of near-term cash flow constraints.

What distinguishes this CBA cycle is that those pressures now intersect with a capital ecosystem that did not exist in prior labor disputes. Since opening the door to PE in 2019, MLB has created a framework for owners to take PE investment, up to 15% ownership stakes per PE sponsor and 30% in the aggregate across financial investors, without relinquishing control. Notably, structured equity has emerged as a preferred instrument for PE sponsors investing into US professional sports, allowing PE sponsor's limited partners to access franchise assets while helping owners manage liquidity and valuation considerations.

The implication is straightforward: the potential labor disruption will not just test and alter baseball economics, but also create opportunity for PE sponsors to get in the game.

What comes next?

As the next phase of CBA negotiations approaches, clubs and ownership groups are not waiting. They are stress-testing downside scenarios, shoring up balance sheets and opening conversations with capital providers before the calendar forces their hand.

For PE sponsors, this cycle demands attention. Labor uncertainty accelerates capital discussions that might otherwise sit in long-term planning. Newly permitted minority investment and other non-control solutions become especially relevant when owners want to preserve control while managing near-term liquidity. Ultimately, this is a cycle that rewards preparation: structuring and diligence on permitted minority stakes take time, and that work is best started well before any disruption hits.

For a premium asset class now open to institutional capital, how clubs navigate this moment will set the precedent for liquidity, ownership flexibility and long-term investment through every labor cycle to come.



Neil Barlow

Partner

Email: neil.barlow@cliffordchance.com

This publication does not necessarily deal with every important topic or cover every aspect of the topics with which it deals. It is not designed to provide legal or other advice.

cliffordchance.com

If you do not wish to receive further information from Clifford Chance about events or legal developments which we believe may be of interest to you, please either send an email to nomorecontact@cliffordchance.com or by post at Clifford Chance LLP, 10 Upper Bank Street, Canary Wharf, London E14 5JJ

Abu Dhabi • Amsterdam • Barcelona • Beijing • Brussels • Bucharest** • Casablanca • Delhi • Dubai • Düsseldorf • Frankfurt • Hong Kong • Houston • Istanbul • London • Luxembourg • Madrid • Milan • Munich • Newcastle • New York • Paris • Perth • Prague** • Riyadh* • Rome • São Paulo • Shanghai • Singapore • Sydney • Tokyo • Warsaw • Washington, D.C.

*AS&H Clifford Chance, a joint venture entered into by Clifford Chance LLP.

**Clifford Chance has entered into association agreements with Clifford Chance Prague Association SRO in Prague and Clifford Chance Badea SPRL in Bucharest.

Clifford Chance has a best friends relationship with Redcliffe Partners in Ukraine.



Eric Schaffer

Partner

Email: eric.schaffer@cliffordchance.com



Ariel Cohen

Associate

Email: ariel.cohen@cliffordchance.com



Danielle Mimeles

Associate

Email: danielle.mimeles@cliffordchance.com