UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA, GREAT FALLS DIVISION

Brian K. Solsrud v. Belt Valley Bank, Bruce A. Hoyer, Cera E. Hoyer, Joshua J. Larson, Suzete L. Maki, Tammy R. Ogle, Jessical Schatzka, Sandy Francom, Robert Kelly, Conn Forder, Benjamin Graybill, and Grian Loucks

Solsrud v. Belt Valley Bank · No. CV-26-08-GF-JTJ · Decided March 25, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Montana denied Brian K. Solsrud’s motion for a temporary restraining order seeking to postpone Belt Valley Bank’s annual shareholder meeting. The court concluded that Solsrud failed to establish the required Winter factors, emphasizing his delay in seeking relief and the availability of later corrective remedies. The court scheduled a hearing on his motion for a preliminary injunction.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Montana, Great Falls Division
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Montana, Great Falls Division
DECIDED	March 25, 2026
DOCKET	CV-26-08-GF-JTJ
DISPOSITION	denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a temporary restraining order preventing the defendant bank from holding its scheduled annual shareholder meeting pending consideration of plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court has discretion to grant or deny preliminary relief. A TRO requires the movant to establish likelihood of success on the merits, likely irreparable harm absent relief, that the balance of equities tips in the movant's favor, and that the injunction is in the public interest. The Ninth Circuit applies these factors on a sliding scale.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown

PARTIES	Brian K. Solsrud v. Belt Valley Bank, Bruce A. Hoyer, Cera E. Hoyer, Joshua J. Larson, Suzete L. Maki, Tammy R. Ogle, Jessical Schatzka, Sandy Francom, Robert Kelly, Conn Forder, Benjamin Graybill, Grian Loucks

TOPICS

injunctions · corporate governance · commercial litigation · civil procedure · equitable relief

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure · corporate law · commercial litigation · remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Solsrud established the requirements for a temporary restraining order preventing Belt Valley Bank from holding its March 26, 2026 annual shareholder meeting.
2. Whether Solsrud demonstrated likely irreparable harm despite waiting until the day before the meeting to seek emergency relief.

HOLDINGS

1. Solsrud failed to establish the Winter factors required for a temporary restraining order, including likely irreparable harm, a favorable balance of equities, and a public interest supporting emergency relief.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *"A party seeking a TRO must establish the following four elements: (1) that they are likely to succeed on the merits; (2) that they are likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of a TRO; (3) that the balance of equities tips in their favor; and (4) that a TRO is in the public interest."* (§ II)

> *"The Ninth Circuit has consistently held that a plaintiff's delay before seeking a temporary restraining order implies a lack of urgency and irreparable harm and weighs against granting a TRO."* (§ III.A)

> *"The possibility that adequate compensatory or other corrective relief will be available at a later date, in the ordinary course of litigation, weighs heavily against a claim of irreparable harm."* (§ III.A)

> *"Purely economic harms are generally not irreparable, as money lost may be recovered later, in the ordinary course of litigation."* (§ III.A)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Solsrud, a shareholder allegedly owning more than 10 percent of the bank's outstanding shares, challenged purported amendments to the bank's bylaws and the bank's issuance of 160 shares to certain officers. He contended that the shares were issued without proper shareholder authority and that the bank failed to convene a special shareholder meeting he requested. After the bank rescheduled its annual meeting for March 26, 2026, Solsrud received notice on March 11 but waited until March 25 to seek a TRO postponing the meeting.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Solsrud filed claims concerning the bank's bylaws, voting requirements, issuance of 160 shares to bank officers, and failure to convene a requested special shareholder meeting. He moved for a TRO on March 25, 2026, one day before the scheduled annual meeting. The court denied the TRO and scheduled a hearing on the preliminary-injunction motion for April 9, 2026.

DISPOSITION

denied

CASES CITED

- Environmental Protection Information Center v. Carlson, 968 F.3d 985, 989 (9th Cir. 2020)
- Don't Shoot Portland v. City of Portland, 465 F. Supp. 3d 1150, 1154 (D. Or. 2020)
- Winter v. Natural Resources Defense Council, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008)
- Alliance for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131–35 (9th Cir. 2011)
- Lopez v. Brewer, 680 F.3d 1068, 1072 (9th Cir. 2012)
- Oakland Tribune, Inc. v. Chronicle Publishing Co., 762 F.2d 1374, 1377 (9th Cir. 1985)
- Sampson v. Murray, 415 U.S. 61, 90 (1974)
- Idaho v. Coeur d'Alene Tribe, 794 F.3d 1039, 1046 (9th Cir. 2015)