

FILED

IN THE CHANCERY COURT, STATE OF WYOMING

2026 WYCH 5

Andrew Meyer and VLM, LLC,
derivatively on behalf of LTNS,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Christopher Mayer, Michael Park,
Jay Byoun, MAVC LLC, and
DTG, LLC,

Defendants.

Case No. CH-2026-0000004

Order Denying Motion for Temporary Restraining Order

[¶1] Plaintiffs request a temporary restraining order halting unapproved sales of a video game and requiring that all revenues from those sales be placed in escrow. They contend that, absent emergency relief, defendants' continued marketing and sale of the game will harm the company on whose behalf they sue, and who they assert developed the game in the first place.

[¶2] The court concludes that it lacks a proper basis to entertain the request. The complaint filed in this case expressly states that its merits—the merits to be considered before injunctive relief could be granted—are currently being litigated in another, unnamed court, and not here in this court. Without a showing that injunctive relief is unavailable in the jurisdiction where plaintiffs originally filed, plaintiffs' motion must be denied.

BACKGROUND

[¶3] This dispute is alleged to have begun as a team effort by a group with a proven track record of success in developing celebrity-branded video games. *Compl.*, FSX No.78293526, ¶ 26. That team included Andrew Meyer, Christopher Mayer, MAVC LLC (affiliated with Michael Park), and VLM LLC (affiliated with Edvard Gezin). *Id.* ¶¶ 2, 4–6, 12–14. Hoping to build on past success, they organized LTNS, LLC under Wyoming law to develop a video game featuring a public figure. *Compl.*, ¶¶ 24–27; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2.

[¶4] LTNS contracted with a company owned by Meyer and Mayer to transfer that company’s intellectual property to LTNS. *Compl.*, ¶ 28; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2. With this intellectual property, LTNS developed a pitch deck and conceptual materials for a Trump-branded golf video game. *See Compl.*, ¶¶ 29–31; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2. Meyer led the effort to connect with the Trump Organization. *Compl.*, ¶ 30; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2. Through these efforts, LTNS secured a non-disclosure agreement with the organization, exchanged a letter of intent, and held meetings that signaled the deal was moving in the right direction. *Compl.*, ¶¶ 32–36; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2

[¶5] But this momentum stalled when communications from the Trump Organization ceased. *Compl.*, ¶ 39. Unbeknownst to Meyer and Gezin at the time, other team members—Mayer, Park, and Byoun—had formed a new Wyoming entity, DTG LLC (possibly an acronym for Donald Trump Golf) to pursue the same opportunity with the Trump Organization for themselves. *Compl.*, ¶¶ 40–44; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2. Plaintiffs allege they were kept in the dark about DTG’s formation and its efforts to secure a licensing arrangement. *Compl.*, ¶ 44; *Mot. TRO*, p. 2.

[¶6] Despite the stalled momentum, LTNS pressed forward in developing the game. *Compl.*, ¶ 46. In March 2024, LTNS produced a video demonstration of the game and provided its game deck to a contact within the Trump Organization. *Id.* ¶¶ 46–48. At the same time, Mayer was allegedly making separate inroads—but not for LTNS. *Id.* ¶ 49. Communications between Mayer and Park and Meyer stopped. *Id.* ¶ 52. Meyer later sent a formal letter by counsel requesting information from Mayer and Park. *Id.* ¶ 53. Mayer and Park never responded. *Id.*

[¶7] A public announcement followed this silence. *Id.* ¶ 54. In December 2024, DTG issued a press release announcing presales for “TRUMP GOLF: THE GAME.” *Id.* The launch video featured intellectual property that plaintiffs claim was developed by LTNS for its demo. *Compl.*, ¶ 55; *Mot. TRO*, pp. 2-3. DTG’s website referenced a name-image-likeness license agreement and indicated the game would launch in summer 2025. *Compl.*, ¶¶ 56–57. Although the game has not yet launched, presales remain available and have been promoted on Truth Social and reported by Fox News. *Id.* ¶¶ 58–60.

[¶8] Plaintiffs (Meyer and VLM LLC) filed this derivative action on behalf of LTNS and against Mayer, Park, Byoun, MAVC LLC, and DTG LLC, seeking a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction based on claims asserted in separate litigation in September of 2025. *Id.* ¶¶ 1, 61–64. In that separate litigation, plaintiffs advance claims that defendants breached contractual and fiduciary duties by forming a competing entity, misusing company assets and confidential information, and commercializing the Trump-branded video game outside the company’s structure. *Id.* ¶¶ 61–63. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and punitive damages in that proceeding. *Id.* ¶ 63. A hearing in those proceedings is scheduled for April 2026. *Id.* ¶ 62.

[¶9] Shortly after filing their complaint in this case, plaintiffs filed a motion seeking a temporary restraining order. (FSX No. 78294814). The requested relief would (1) prohibit any sale or transfer of the game without plaintiffs’ prior written consent and (2) require that all revenues from the game, including presale proceeds, be deposited into escrow for the duration of the litigation. *Mot. TRO*, pp. 1, 10–15. Plaintiffs contend this relief is necessary to preserve the status quo and prevent irreparable harm. *Id.*

[¶10] The motion argues that plaintiffs have a substantial likelihood of prevailing against the defendants named here on the merits of four claims: (1) breach of contract; (2) breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing; (3) breach of statutorily imposed fiduciary duties owed by LLC managers; and (4) civil conspiracy. The complaint filed in this case does not include any such claims.

LEGAL STANDARDS

[¶11] Injunctions are “discretionary requests for equitable relief.” *Brown v. Best Home Health & Hospice, LLC*, 2021 WY 83, ¶ 8, 491 P.3d 1021, 1026 (Wyo. 2021). A court’s equitable power, including the ability to issue injunctions, generally reaches only the merits of a case brought before it. *See Pac. Radiation Oncology, LLC v. Queen’s Med. Ctr.*, 810 F.3d 631, 633 (9th Cir. 2015). A preliminary injunction’s purpose is “to preserve the status quo until the merits of an action can be determined.” *Id.* ¶ 7, 491 P.3d at 1026.

[¶12] Injunctions are “extraordinary remedies” with “far-reaching force” that require “caution” and “delicate judicial” consideration. *Operation Save Am. v. Jackson*, 2012 WY 51 ¶ 19, 275 P.3d 438, 447 (Wyo. 2012) (internal citation omitted). *See also Malave v. W. Wyoming Beverages, Inc.*, 2022 WY 14, ¶¶ 7-8, 503 P.3d 36, 39 (Wyo. 2022). A party seeking such relief must make a clear showing of (1) probable success on the merits and (2) possible irreparable injury if the injunction is denied. *CBM Geosolutions, Inc. v. Gas Sensing Tech. Corp.*, 2009 WY 113, ¶¶ 7-10, 215 P.3d 1054, 1057-58 (Wyo. 2009). In making that showing, the admissible evidence received on the motion automatically “becomes part of the trial record and need not be repeated at trial.” W.R.C.P.Ch.C. 65(a)(2).

[¶13] At times, dismissal of a tandem proceeding is necessary “to maintain the integrity of the judicial system, discourage redundant actions, and minimize their attendant problems”; Wyoming courts have discretion to “dismiss an action due to a pending proceeding[.]” *Heilig v. Wyoming Game & Fish Comm’n*, 2003 WY 27, ¶ 13, 64 P.3d 734, 739 (Wyo. 2003); *TEP Rocky Mountain LLC v. Rec. TJ Ranch Ltd. P’ship*, 2022 WY 105, ¶ 58, 516 P.3d 459, 477 (Wyo. 2022). In particular, Wyoming courts will not entertain “a separate suit” seeking an injunction when that relief is available in “an action already begun[.]” *Olson v. Leith*, 71 Wyo. 316, 329, 257 P.2d 342, 347 (Wyo. 1953).

DISCUSSION

[¶14] The complaint filed in this lawsuit alleges that the merits of plaintiffs' four claims—claims not before this court—are to be adjudicated by another judge in April. This court is unaware of any jurisdiction that does not allow temporary injunctive relief, and plaintiffs have not explained why they cannot seek that relief in the pending lawsuit they filed last September. Consequently, Wyoming precedent counsels that the court should deny the motion. *See Olson*, 71 Wyo. at 329, 257 P.2d at 347.

[¶15] Rule 65(a)(2) likewise suggests denial. Any evidence used by the court in determining whether to grant the preliminary injunction would automatically become part of the trial record in this case—to be shortly followed by a new trial before a different judge in the court where the underlying claims are currently pending. The court believes that the motion must be denied to maintain the integrity and economy of the judicial system.

CONCLUSION

[¶16] Plaintiffs have not shown that they would be unable to obtain the relief requested by their motion and complaint in the pending proceeding they filed last September. The court exercises its discretion to **DENY** the motion.

Dated: 2/6/2026

/s/ Benjamin M. Burningham
CHANCERY COURT JUDGE