

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
MECKLENBURG COUNTY

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION
20CVS010612-590

NANCY WRIGHT; GREG WRIGHT;
and JODY STANSELL, individually
and as members of LORUSSO
VENTURES, LLC d/b/a
CINCH.SKIRT,

Plaintiffs,

v.

KRISTA LORUSSO, individually and
as a member-manager of LORUSSO
VENTURES, LLC d/b/a
CINCH.SKIRT,

Defendant,

v.

LORUSSO VENTURES, LLC d/b/a
CINCH.SKIRT,

Nominal
Defendant.

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S
OMNIBUS MOTION**

1. This case is set to begin trial on 23 February 2026. As pretrial preparation got underway, Plaintiff Jody Stansell filed an omnibus motion styled “Plaintiff’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, Preliminary Injunction, Accounting, Disgorgement, Repayment of Legal Fees, Summary Judgment, and Sanctions.” (ECF No. 286.) The time for further briefing has passed, and in its discretion, the Court elects to decide the motion without a hearing. *See* BCR 7.4.*

* Despite electing to decide the motion without oral argument, the Court intended to discuss the motion’s defects with Stansell at the pretrial hearing in this matter on 6 February 2026. That discussion did not occur, however, because Stansell did not attend the pretrial hearing.

2. A short background will help frame the discussion. This case, which is over five years old, arises out of a dispute among the members of LoRusso Ventures, LLC. Stansell, Greg Wright, and Nancy Wright (the minority members) sued Krista LoRusso (the majority member) and asserted more than a dozen direct and derivative claims for relief. LoRusso responded with counterclaims, as did LoRusso Ventures. After a contentious discovery period, the Court resolved the parties' motions for summary judgment and put the case on the trial calendar for June 2025. Just before trial, the Wrights settled their disputes with LoRusso and LoRusso Ventures, dismissed their claims, and sold their membership interests in the LLC. At the same time, Stansell's counsel withdrew due to a conflict. After giving Stansell, as the only remaining plaintiff, a reasonable period to try to retain new counsel, the Court reset the case for trial in February 2026. Stansell did not retain new counsel and now represents himself.

3. In advance of trial, Stansell has filed a scattershot motion in which he seeks at least seven forms of relief. Each aspect of his motion is either untimely or not yet ripe, and in many respects, the motion resurrects arguments that Stansell made through counsel and that the Court rejected years ago.

4. Let's begin with Stansell's motion for summary judgment—his fourth such motion. The Court denied the first on the merits and struck the second and third for violating Business Court Rules. *See generally Wright v. LoRusso*, 2023 NCBC LEXIS 66 (N.C. Super. Ct. May 4, 2023); *Wright v. LoRusso*, 2023 NCBC LEXIS 68 (N.C. Super. Ct. May 4, 2023). This latest motion is too late by nearly three years: the

court-ordered deadline to move for summary judgment was in March 2023. (*See* ECF No. 154.) Worse yet, the motion seeks judgment as to at least one claim that has been dismissed (breach of fiduciary duty) and another that was never asserted (conversion). To put it bluntly, Stansell's fourth request for summary judgment is untimely, duplicative, and facially meritless.

5. The same is true for the request for emergency injunctive relief. In early 2022, Stansell (through counsel) moved for a preliminary injunction. The Court denied that motion, observing that Stansell had waited three years to seek relief after becoming aware of the alleged misconduct in late 2018 or early 2019. *See Wright v. LoRusso*, 2022 NCBC LEXIS 68, at *2–3 (N.C. Super. Ct. Mar. 10, 2022) (contrasting “lengthy, unexplained delay” with Stansell’s assertion that he “face[d] imminent, irreparable harm”). Now, Stansell once again seeks a similar injunction for similar reasons. What has changed? Nothing, other than that nearly four more years have passed. The Court’s earlier decision stands. There was no emergency calling for extraordinary relief in 2022, and there is certainly none now.

6. Stansell’s request for an accounting is, if possible, even more misguided because he voluntarily dismissed his accounting claim against LoRusso last year. (*See* ECF No. 246.) Perhaps Stansell means to assert his statutory inspection rights as a member of LoRusso Ventures. Again, though, the Court has already considered and denied that requested relief. *See Wright*, 2022 NCBC LEXIS 68, at *3 (noting that inspection demand “must be sought against the LLC” but that Stansell’s

pleading “stresses that no claim, whether direct or derivative, is stated against the LLC” (cleaned up)).

7. Little needs to be said about the remaining requests. Disgorgement and attorneys’ fees are remedies. Stansell may be entitled to a remedy of some kind if he prevails on his claims at trial. To seek these remedies now, however, is to put the cart before the horse. As for Stansell’s request for sanctions, the Court cannot make heads or tails of it. He complains that LoRusso has made false statements in pleadings and withheld documents in discovery but fails to identify the statements, pleadings, and documents at issue. No basis exists to award any of this requested relief.

8. The Court **DENIES** the motion in its entirety.

SO ORDERED, this the 9th day of February, 2026.

/s/ Adam M. Conrad
Adam M. Conrad
Special Superior Court Judge
for Complex Business Cases