

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA
COUNTY OF GREENVILLE

IN THE COURT OF COMMON
PLEAS
THIRTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT

Frank George Rogers, individually and
derivatively as a member and on behalf
of Exodus Aircraft, LLC,

Plaintiffs/Petitioners,

DECISION AND ORDER

v.

Joshua Brett Kimbrell, Liliya Shcherba
Robertson Kimbrell, Exodus Airways,
LLC, Thomas Blake Whitaker,

Defendants/Respondents.

CASE OVERVIEW

This underlying lawsuit involves an alleged diversion and conversion of millions of dollars in corporate funds by Joshua Brett Kimbrell (“Josh Kimbrell” or “Kimbrell”), while acting as manager and fiduciary of Exodus Aircraft, LLC (“Exodus”).

Josh Kimbrell, Defendant, allegedly used another corporate entity to funnel Exodus’ corporate funds into the coffers of Exodus Airways, LLC, (“Airways”) a limited liability company organized by Kimbrell in order to capitalize upon the confusion caused by the similarity between the two corporate names.

On July 11, 2025, the Court issued a temporary restraining order prohibiting Kimbrell from interfering with the business operations of Exodus. Subsequently, on

July 21, 2025, the parties signed a Consent Order Granting Preliminary Injunctive Relief (“Preliminary Injunction Order”) that further enjoined the conduct of Defendants Josh and Liliya Sheherba Robertson Kimbrell from engaging in Exodus’ business operations.

On August 21, 2025, Frank George Rogers and Exodus Aircraft, LLC, Plaintiffs, filed a Petition For a Rule to Show Cause. The Petition alleges Defendants Josh and Liliya Kimbrell violated numerous provisions of the Temporary Restraining Order and the Preliminary Injunction Order in an attempt to disrupt Plaintiffs’ business operations.

Plaintiffs seek sanctions and payment of attorney fees and costs for Defendants’ violations of the Court Orders.

On December 19, 2025, a hearing on Plaintiffs’ petition was scheduled. Defendants did not appear, despite receiving timely and proper notice of the hearing. The hearing proceeded as scheduled despite Defendants’ absence.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On July 10, 2025, Plaintiffs Frank George Rogers and Exodus Aircraft LLC, filed a Verified Complaint against Defendants setting forth factual allegations concerning a systematic pattern of fraud and deceit. Defendants Josh and Liliya Kimbrell are alleged to have created a sham entity, named Exodus Airways, LLC

(Airways) as a corporate entity to facilitate the diversion and conversion of monies from Exodus and Frank George Rogers.

Upon filing the Verified Complaint, Plaintiffs requested the Court grant a Temporary Restraining Order (“TRO”). Plaintiffs sought the TRO to prevent Defendants from diverting monies from Exodus to Airways.

After reviewing Plaintiffs’ evidentiary submissions, the Court granted a TRO, which was issued on July 11, 2025. Defendants were not formally served with a copy of the TRO until July 14, 2025.¹

Plaintiffs allege Defendants violated provisions 1-3, 11, 13 of the TRO. In summary, the violations of the aforesaid provisions allegedly disrupted Exodus’ business operations; involved unauthorized communications about Plaintiffs’ business affairs with customers, suppliers and vendors; attempted to dissolve Exodus; and resulted in the destruction, concealment and removal of property.

Defendants argue the communications, destruction of property, *inter alia* were not binding upon Defendants until service of the temporary restraining order on July 14, 2025. Thus, until the temporary restraining order was effectively served, Defendants assert they were not bound by its provisions.

¹ Plaintiffs contend Defendants’ initial attorney, Vanessa Kormalo, accepted service of the TRO on July 12, 2025. However, the Notice of Electronic Filing [NEF] reflects that Defendants were not served at issuance of the TRO and had to be served by traditional means.

Conversely, Plaintiffs assert Defendants had constructive notice of the temporary restraining order as early as July 12, 2025, by virtue of a news article and communications with fellow employee, Kelly Collins.

In short, Plaintiffs argue because Defendants had constructive notice of the TRO, their actions and communications prior to July 14, 2025, were a willful and clear violation of the Court's order.

Violations of the Temporary Restraining Order TRO

Plaintiffs accuse Josh and Liliya Kimbrell of violating the Temporary Restraining Order. The identified violations include the following:

A. Violation of TRO Provisions 1 and 3:

Provision 1 of the TRO mandates that “[n]o action shall be taken by any of the Restrained Parties that would change the rights or obligations of Exodus Aircraft pending the outcome of the hearing on a preliminary injunction.” The TRO restrained Defendant from changing the rights or obligations of Exodus.

Provision 3 of the TRO mandates that “no corporate changes shall occur.”

On July 13, 2025, Josh Kimbrell emailed his attorney Vanessa Kormylo and directed her to send “disassociation forms” to the Delaware Secretary of State. Josh Kimbrell did not attach a disassociation form, but rather a dissolution form to the email.

By sending a dissolution form to his attorney, Plaintiffs argue Josh Kimbrell attempted to dissolve Exodus as a Delaware corporation in violation of TRO Provision 3. Plaintiffs contend the filing of a dissolution form would have severely damaged Exodus by dissolving its corporate structure and destroying its ability to conduct business.

B. Violation of TRO Provision 2:

Provision 2 of the TRO mandates that “[n]o advisory committees shall be formed.” As such, Defendants Josh and Liliya Kimbrell were restrained from forming advisory committees.

On July 12, 2025, Josh Kimbrell emailed Stephan Hollmann of PACAVI International, copying Richard Lackey, Jere Davis, Brian Atkinson, and Dan Nickles. In this email, Josh Kimbrell notified Hollmann of his resignation and referenced an “investor council,” stating: *“I have copied members of our investor council on this email, perhaps they can work with you on this matter going forward.”*

Frank Rogers asserts he never attended a meeting nor voted to approve an investor council, and therefore, no investor council existed in relation to Exodus prior to the entry of the TRO; and any such entity exists entirely as a result of Josh Kimbrell’s subsequent creation.

By directing Hollmann to seek assistance from this investor council in matters concerning Exodus, Plaintiffs contend Josh Kimbrell knowingly and intentionally bypassed Rogers and ostensibly superseded Rogers' authority.

Thus, by referencing these individuals and involving them in ongoing company business, Plaintiffs argue Josh Kimbrell formed, activated, and utilized an advisory group in connection with Exodus Aircraft's affairs, which violated TRO Provision 2.

C. Violation of TRO Provision 11:

Provision 11 of the TRO specifically provides: "All documents, emails, correspondence, business records, text messages, and evidence of any kind potentially relating to Exodus Air and also the subject of this dispute shall not be destroyed, lost, or removed out of any Restrained Defendants' possession."

Plaintiffs assert Josh and Liliya Kimbrell repeatedly, knowingly, and intentionally violated this provision of the TRO.

In particular, Defendants began archiving and deleting emails, business records, documents, correspondence, and evidence as early as July 12, 2025, while on vacation in Bermuda. Defendant Liliya Kimbrell permanently deleted her entire email mailbox on July 12, 2025. Liliya Kimbrell continued to delete emails in her account as late as August 2, 2025.

Defendant Josh Kimbrell also began to archive and/or delete emails, calendar invites, and other evidence from his email account beginning on July 12, 2025, until August 2, 2025.

D. Violation of TRO Provision 13:

Provision 13 of the TRO specifically provides that “[a]s related to Exodus Air, excepting only the ordinary and normal course of business, all other matters shall strictly remain status quo”.

On July 12, 2025, Defendant Josh Kimbrell engaged in a flurry of email communications to vendors, customers, regulators, and staff that he “had resigned” as CEO and “accountable (sic) manager”, that the company was the victim of a “hostile takeover”, and that his “legal team will deal with Frank and his guys”.

On July 12, 2025, Defendant Josh Kimbrell emailed an Exodus Aircraft fuel supplier, Total Air Services, and announced his resignation from the company. This email prompted Total Air Services, a supplier, to respond that the line of credit was extended with the understanding Josh Kimbrell would be leading and managing the company, and that Total Air Services would not provide any aircraft fuel until discussions could take place.

On July 12, 2025, Defendant Josh Kimbrell sent a separate email to Armando Vidalon of World Fuel Services, another of Exodus Air’s fuel suppliers, stating that he no longer served as the CEO of Exodus Aircraft.

Plaintiffs assert these emails were attempts to disrupt fuel supply for Exodus Air and disrupt the “status quo”.

As part of the July 12, 2025, email flurry, Defendant Josh Kimbrell emailed Robby Benton with Rick Ware Racing, a customer of Exodus. Josh Kimbrell copied his attorney, several Exodus Aircraft employees, and several members of the “investment council” on this communication. Kimbrell stated: “I am not longer CEO of Exodus Aircraft... [Frank Rogers] will be your contact for all flights for the rest of the season for NASCAR.”

Plaintiffs argue the aforementioned emails were sent with the intention of disrupting the “status quo” and cause harm upon Exodus’ relationship with its customers, suppliers, and vendors in violation of TRO Provision 13.

Violations of the Consent Order/Preliminary Injunction Order

Defendants Josh and Liliya Kimbrell signed a Consent Order granting Preliminary Injunctive Relief to Plaintiffs on July 21, 2025. Defendants received notice of the entry of the Preliminary Injunction Order through electronic service upon their counsel of record, Douglas Brannon, on July 22, 2025.

Plaintiffs allege Defendants Josh and Liliya Kimbrell violated the Consent Preliminary Injunction Order. The alleged violations are as follows:

A. Violation of Preliminary Injunction Paragraph 4:

Paragraph 4 of the Consent Preliminary Injunction provides Josh Kimbrell “shall surrender to Plaintiffs’ counsel all business records and all information in his possession and control relating to Exodus so as to facilitate a smooth transition of Exodus’ management.”

Plaintiffs contend Defendants have violated this process by failing to provide documents to Exodus needed to file corporate tax returns and to continuously operate the business.

B. Violation of Preliminary Injunction Paragraph 9:

Paragraph 9 of the Preliminary Injunction provides that: “[u]ntil there is a final adjudication in this action and to the extent any of the Enjoined Parties have in their possession and control any documents, emails, correspondence, business records, text messages, or evidence of any kind potentially relating to Exodus Aircraft and also the subject of this dispute, such materials shall be preserved and shall not be destroyed, lost, or removed from any Enjoined Parties’ possession and *Enjoined Parties hereby certify they have not destroyed any such materials since the issuance of the TRO* by the Court.

Defendants Josh and Liliya Kimbrell executed the consent agreement and certified to the Court that they “have not destroyed any such materials since the issuance of the TRO.”

Defendant Liliya Kimbrell certified she had not destroyed any emails or evidence of any kind since the issuance of the TRO on July 11, 2025, despite deleting emails beginning on July 12, 2025. Likewise, Defendant Josh Kimbrell certified he had not destroyed any emails or evidence of any kind since the issuance of the TRO, despite archiving and deleting a vast number of emails on July 12, 2025.

C. Violation of Preliminary Injunction Paragraph 10:

Paragraph 10 of the Consent Preliminary Injunction provides the “Enjoined Parties shall altogether cease using the names Exodus Airways, LLC, Exodus Aircraft, LLC, Exodus Air, Exodus, or any similar permutation using the term Exodus and shall not act in such a fashion as might cause a reasonable and ordinary person to conclude mistakenly that they have affiliation with Exodus Aircraft.”

VENUE & JURISDICTION

This Court has jurisdiction to hear this action pursuant to Article V, §11 of the South Carolina Constitution, S.C. Code § 14-1-80, and South Carolina common law.

Venue properly exists in Greenville because one or more Defendants reside in Greenville County, South Carolina. S.C. Coe Ann. §15-7-30(2005).

EVIDENCE

First, Micah Sturgis, President of Sturgis Forensics, LLC, is a Digital Forensic Consultant. Mr. Sturgis was qualified as an expert in digital forensics.

Mr. Sturgis analyzed the Defendants' email mailboxes on August 2, 2025. The analysis revealed that 246 emails or calendar events were deleted from Josh Kimbrell's account from July 19, 2025, to August 2, 2025.

Mr. Sturgis further testified six emails or calendar events were deleted from Liliya Kimbrell's account from July 19, 2025, to August 2, 2025.

Finally, Mr. Sturgis testified thousands of emails were deleted from Defendants' mailboxes from June 2025 to July 12, 2025.

Second, Richard Phillip Carter testified Josh Kimbrell had deleted an email, which he had forwarded to himself on July 21, 2025. The email included an attachment titled "Exodus Aircraft AOC Properties". This document included corporate financial information and a profit and loss statement.

According to Mr. Carter, Josh Kimbrell forwarded another email dated July 29, 2025 to Doug Brennan at Priority 1 Group. The attachment contained the Profit and Loss Statement of Exodus from January 2024 to December 2024.

Third, Elisha Leonard, Controller for Exodus, testified she was tasked with monitoring the email accounts of the Defendants; and the bank account of Exodus. Ms. Leonard's testimony corroborated the testimony of Mr. Carter.

Finally, Kelly Collins, flight attendant for Exodus, testified about the events surrounding her communication with Defendants on July 12, 2025, which transpired after the issuance of the TRO. Ms. Collins testified Liliya Kimbrell contacted her on July 12, 2025, at 3:42 PM discussing the TRO and news article.

Based upon the foregoing evidence and testimonies of the witnesses, the following findings of facts are made.

FINDINGS OF FACT

A. TRO Violations

1. Despite receiving timely, proper and adequate notice of the Rule to Show Cause Hearing, Defendants willfully failed to appear. Defendants did not provide an explanation or legal or medical excuse for their failure to appear other than they were not under subpoena to appear in court. This explanation as a defense is not legally viable, persuasive or applicable.
2. Defendants' absence from the court proceeding was without a valid excuse. Additionally, Defendants did not request a continuance or postponement of the proceedings.
3. Plaintiffs filed a Petition for Rule to Show Cause on August 21, 2025. Defendants filed an answer to the Petition for Rule to Show Cause on September 26, 2025. Plaintiffs' petition alleges Defendants violated a TRO

dated July 11, 2025 and a Preliminary Injunction Order via a Consent Order dated July 21, 2025.

4. Plaintiffs proved by clear and convincing evidence that Defendants willfully violated Provisions 3 and 11 of the Temporary Restraining Order (TRO) after acceptance of service of the TRO on July 14, 2025. As a result, the Court finds Defendants are in contempt of Court.
5. It is undisputed and unrefuted Defendants deleted or transferred thousands of emails beginning on July 12, 2025, while on vacation.
6. Defendants had only constructive notice of the TRO when they deleted and transferred company emails on July 12-13, 2025.
7. Despite ostensible constructive notice of the TRO, the TRO was not formally served upon the Defendants until July 14, 2025. The Court relies upon the Notice of Electronic Filing [NEF], which states the TRO had to be served by mail or personal service on Defendants. Until the TRO was formally served upon Defendants, it cannot be legally found and concluded that service was effective and proper prior to July 14, 2025. Therefore, the TRO was not binding upon Defendants until this date.
8. Defendants willfully deleted and transferred many emails from July 14, 2025, to August 2, 2025. These transfers and deletions certainly and clearly are

in violation of the TRO Provision 11 and constitute contemptible actions by Defendants.

9. Josh Kimbrell's communication with employees of Exodus, business partners and vendors cannot be construed to have violated Provision 13 of the TRO prior to service of the TRO. Many of the communications can be construed simply as instructions to employees and vendors to communicate with Frank George Rogers with respect to ongoing concerns of Exodus, because of Kimbrell's decision to resign from the company. Plaintiffs failed to prove a violation of the TRO Provision 13 by clear and convincing evidence regarding communications with employees and vendors of Exodus on July 12-13, 2025.
10. Josh Kimbrell's instructions to his attorney to file a disassociation form with the Delaware Secretary of State, while attaching a corporate dissolution form, which was never filed, did not violate Provisions 1 and 3 of the TRO by clear and convincing evidence. Kimbrell's communication regarding the filing of a disassociation with his attorney was neither clear nor convincing but was ambiguous when coupled with the attached corporate dissolution form. Moreover, the form was never sent to or filed with the Delaware Secretary of State. Thus, Plaintiffs failed to prove Kimbrell violated Provisions 1 and 3 of the TRO in this instance.

B. Preliminary Injunction Order Violations

11. Josh Kimbrell signed the Consent Preliminary Injunction on July 21, 2025.

That very same day, Defendant Josh Kimbrell forwarded an email to his personal email account entitled “Fw: Exodus Aircraft AOC Prospectus”. This email included an attachment with confidential Exodus Air information relevant to a potential sale of the company-owned aircraft, including corporate financial information, such as revenue information, customer projections, profit and loss statements, and valuations.

Josh Kimbrell’s actions were a willful violation of the requirement that he “surrender all business records and all information in his possession”, and exhibited a blatant disregard for the Court’s orders, and a lack of concern for truthfulness. This action violated Paragraph 4 of the Preliminary Injunction Order and constitutes contempt of Court.

12. Clearly and convincingly, Josh Kimbrell’s July 29, 2025 e-mail to Doug Brennan attaching a 2024 Profit and Loss Statement of Exodus violated the Preliminary Injunction Order Paragraphs 4 and 9. In particular, Paragraph 4 requires Josh Kimbrell to surrender to Plaintiffs’ counsel all business records and all information in his possession and control relating to Exodus so as to facilitate a smooth transition of Exodus management. Paragraph 9 further mandates Josh Kimbrell to preserve all records in his possession, and such

shall not be destroyed, lost or removed. The e-mail attaching Exodus' financial records to Doug Brennan and a subsequent deletion of the email was a willful and contemptible violation of the Order.

13. Josh Kimbrell also violated Paragraph 9 by deleting and not forwarding emails to Exodus regarding outstanding invoices. For example, the invoice from Aircraft Performance Group, LLC, was never sent to Exodus for payment. Similarly, an invoice in the amount of \$545.48 from MWA or the Williamson County Airport Authority was never forwarded to Exodus for payment. Josh Kimbrell's actions precluded a smooth transition regarding the change in management.
14. Elisha Leonard testified that because of Defendant's actions of deleting various emails containing invoices, Exodus discovered that there were approximately \$600,000 in outstanding bills. This action certainly and convincingly constitutes a violation of the Preliminary Injunction and is contempt of Court.

Josh Kimbrell's e-mail communications to Vin Frey with respect to an "Investor Update" on October 14, 2025, violated both the TRO and the Preliminary Injunction Order. The communications with Mr. Frey impacted the ongoing business operations of Exodus and is subject to contempt of Court.

15. Defendants surrendered all ownership interests in Exodus which included limited liability units, bank accounts, all corporate causes of action, all interests of any kind, whether corporate or personal, and agreed to transfer all paperwork to Plaintiffs. Pursuant to the Preliminary Injunction Order, the injunction further provided that until there is a final adjudication in this action, Plaintiffs were to preserve and not destroy all documents, emails, correspondence, business records, text messages or any evidence potentially relating to Exodus. Paragraph 9 of the Preliminary Injunction Order states in part:

such materials shall be preserved and shall not be destroyed, lost, or removed from any Enjoined Parties' possession and enjoined parties hereby certify that they have not destroyed any such materials since the issuance of the TRO by the court.

16. Based upon unrefuted evidence, documents and emails were destroyed or deleted since the issuance of the TRO dated July 11, 2025. Thousands of emails were deleted by Defendants while on vacation in Bermuda beginning on July 12, 2025. In fact, a vast number of emails were deleted and were not forwarded to Exodus even after the issuance of the TRO and Preliminary Injunction Order.

17. The Court does not find Josh Kimbrell's Facebook video and article published by Fits Forum violated the TRO or the Preliminary Injunction Order. Defendant addressed his candidacy as Governor for the State of South

Carolina and referenced the lawsuit and the other lawsuits against his former partner, which are all matters of public record. Thus, balancing Josh Kimbrell's First Amendment Rights, the Court does not find Defendant's action contemptible by clear and convincing evidence.

18. Plaintiffs failed to prove Defendants violated Paragraph 10 of the Preliminary Injunction Order regarding continued use of the name Exodus Airways, LLC, Exodus Air or Exodus.
19. There is no dispute that Defendants concealed, deleted and destroyed emails, documents, correspondence, and evidence since the **issuance** of the TRO on July 11, 2025, according to the testimonies of Micah Sturgis, Elisha Leonard and Richard Carter. By virtue of the plain language of the Preliminary Injunction Order, Defendants have willfully violated the provisions of the Court's order and are subject to contempt sanctions.
20. Plaintiffs also argue Defendants also had a common law and statutory duty not to interrupt the business and operations of Exodus with specific regard to TRO Provision 2. Clearly, the laws governing limited liability companies place a fiduciary duty upon Josh Kimbrell to act in good faith, which he certainly failed to do. However, the issue before this Court is whether Defendants violated the TRO and the Preliminary Injunction Order. The decision as to whether Josh Kimbrell violated his common law duty or

statutory duty is best left to the discretion of the trial judge and a jury. This includes whether a jury charge of spoliation is warranted regarding Defendants' actions beginning on July 12, 2025.

21. Plaintiffs proved Defendants willfully violated the Court Orders by clear and convincing evidence. As such, Plaintiffs are entitled to reimbursement of fees and costs (including attorney's fees), because of Defendants' violations, which are deemed as compensatory contempt. As such, Plaintiffs are entitled to payment of \$9,268.75 for reimbursement for necessary expenses expended for forensic expert services in its proof of Defendants' violations of the Court's Orders. Defendants are Ordered to pay \$9,268.75 within 30 days from the date of this Order.
22. Defendants have not provided documents that Exodus needs to file tax returns pursuant to the Preliminary Injunction Order. This violation also constitutes discovery abuse pursuant to Rules 30 and 37 of the South Carolina Rules of Civil Procedure. Thus, Plaintiffs' Counsel shall provide the Court with an attorney fee affidavit within 10 days of this Order for review and approval.
23. With regard to the requested documents to enable a smooth corporate transition, Defendants shall produce all requested documents as referenced in the TRO and Preliminary Injunction Order within 30 days, absent an agreement by the parties or further Order of the Court. Defendants' failure to

comply with the TRO, Preliminary Injunction Order and this Order after 30 days, shall result in a \$250.00 per day fine thereafter until Defendants produce the requested documents and abide by the terms of the Court's Orders absent an agreement by the parties or Order of the Court.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. The burden of proof in a civil contempt case is clear and convincing evidence. *Poston v. Poston*, 331 S.C. 106, 113, 502 S.E. 2d 86, 89 (1998). "Civil contempt occurs when a party willfully disobeys a clear and definite court order." *Campione v. Best*, 435 S.C. 451, 457, 868 S.E.2d 378, 381 (Ct. App. 2021) (citing *Phillips v. Phillips*, 288 S.C. 185, 188, 341 S.E.2d 132, 133 (1986)).
2. Civil Contempt is imposed to coerce describe behavior or compliance. (*Jarrell v. Petoseed Co., INC.*, 331 S.C. 207, 500 S.E. 2d 793(Ct. App. 1998).
3. Civil Contempt is imposed as a remedy for the effect of non-compliance with an Order (Compensatory Contempt, *Id.* See also, *a Matter of Estate of Combis v. George Comet. Al.*, 439 S.C. 485, 888 S.E. 2d 1 (ct. App. 2023).
4. Rules 30 and 37, SCRCP (2025) governs award for attorney fees at sanctions for discovery abuse.
5. *S.C. Code Ann. §14-5-320 (2025)* governs contempt of Court authority by Circuit Courts.

6. *S.C. Code Ann. §33-44-408 (2025)* governs a member's right to information.
7. *S.C. Code Ann. §33-44-409 (2025)* governs standards of member's conduct.

ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED Defendants Joshua and Liliya Kimbrell willfully violated provisions of the Temporary Restraining Order and the Preliminary Injunction Order, and therefore, Defendants are in contempt of Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Defendant shall pay and compensate Plaintiffs in the amount of \$9,268.75 (compensatory contempt) which does not include the experts' time spent in Court within 30 days of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Defendants shall produce all requested documents as agreed to by the parties pursuant to the Preliminary Injunction Order within 30 days from the date of issuance of this Order. In the event Defendants fail to comply with all orders issued by the Court, Defendant shall be subject to a \$250.00 per day fine thereafter until agreement of the parties or further Order of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Plaintiffs' counsel shall submit to this Court an attorney fee affidavit within 10 days for review and approval.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED Defendants shall pay all approved attorney fees and costs within 20 days of the Court's approval and the ordering of payment of such.

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.

Vernon F. Dunbar, Judge
Thirteenth Judicial Circuit

Greenville, South Carolina
_____, 2026

FITSNEWS



Greenville Common Pleas

Case Caption: Frank George Rogers , plaintiff, et al vs. Joshua Brett Kimbrell ,
defendant, et al
Case Number: 2025CP2304210
Type: Order/Other

So Ordered

Vernon F. Dunbar

Electronically signed on 2026-03-12 14:28:17 page 23 of 23