

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
MECKLENBURG COUNTY

IN THE GENERAL COURT OF JUSTICE
SUPERIOR COURT DIVISION
Case No. 25CV036003-590

RPAC RACING, LLC, d/b/a/ LEGACY)
MOTOR CLUB,)
)
Plaintiff,)

v.)

T.J. PUCHYR and RUCUS RACING,)
LLC,)
)
Defendants.)

AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, RPAC Racing, LLC, d/b/a/ Legacy Motor Club (“Legacy”), by and through undersigned counsel, hereby complains of Defendants T.J. Puchyr and Rucus Racing, LLC (“Rucus”).

INTRODUCTION

1. This action arises from Defendant T.J. Puchyr’s willful interference in Legacy’s Charter Purchase Agreement with Rick Ware Racing, LLC (“RWR”).

2. Legacy and Mr. Puchyr have had a long business relationship. On August 1, 2023, Mr. Puchyr signed, on behalf of his consulting firm Rucus, an Independent Contractor Agreement with Legacy to assist it with securing a key sponsorship (the “Rucus Agreement”). In accordance with the Rucus Agreement, Mr. Puchyr was given access to confidential and sensitive business information so that he could promote Legacy and its principals in order to help Legacy secure a sponsorship deal. Legacy trusted Mr. Puchyr. By engaging Mr. Puchyr, Legacy expected him to act with integrity and to refrain from actions that would undermine Legacy’s operations, reputation, or competitive standing. It further expected Mr. Puchyr to avoid any conflicts of

interest, disclose any circumstances that might compromise his impartiality, and comply with ethical standards that reinforce Legacy's trust in his services.

3. Mr. Puchyr has betrayed Legacy's trust. Among other things, Mr. Puchyr embarked on a campaign to interfere with Legacy's pending transaction to purchase a NASCAR Cup Series Charter from RWR that was the subject of a separate lawsuit in this Court. *See RPAC Racing, LLC v. Rick Ware Racing, LLC*, No. 25CV016837-590 (N.C. Super.). Not only did Mr. Puchyr work behind the scenes to upend Legacy's deal with RWR, he boasted about his malfeasance, criticizing Legacy and its principals, while touting his underhanded attempt to strip Legacy of its bargained-for right to a Charter from RWR.¹

4. Mr. Puchyr's conduct is particularly reprehensible given his personal involvement in Legacy's transaction with RWR. In early January 2025, Mr. Puchyr arranged a meeting between Legacy's CEO Calvin "Cal" Wells III and RWR's owner Rick Ware to begin discussing a possible transaction between the parties. After several weeks of negotiations, Legacy and RWR executed a Charter Purchase Agreement under which Legacy would acquire one of RWR's two NASCAR Charters (the "RWR Agreement") on March 3, 2025.

5. Shortly thereafter, a dispute arose over which of RWR's two Charters was the subject of the parties' deal: Charter #27 or Charter #36. When Legacy learned that RWR was purportedly shopping both Charters to other prospective buyers, it filed suit in this Court on April 1 and requested a preliminary injunction to prevent the sale or encumbrance of Charter #27, given the existence of the RWR Agreement. RWR opposed the preliminary injunction, asserting that it did not agree to sell Charter #27 but that it would sell Charter #36 to Legacy. Indeed, Mr. Ware

¹ Jenna Fryer, *T.J. Puchyr agrees to buy Rick Ware Racing with plans to build a 3-car NASCAR team*, THE ASSOCIATED PRESS (Jun. 26, 2025), <https://apnews.com/article/nascar-rickware-racing-puchyr-ccd9b642548cfa30192befe81b15ad3>.

confirmed, through counsel and directly to this Court, that he would honor his promise to sell Legacy one of his two charters. At the parties' hearing over Legacy's request for injunctive relief, RWR's counsel assured the Court that no injunction was necessary because RWR would not sell Charter #27 because it would "put[] Rick Ware out of business." No. 25CV016837-590, April 30, 2025 Hearing on Preliminary Injunction, Recording ("Rec.") 1:12:26–1:12:32.² RWR's counsel told the Court that an injunction would harm RWR, but "the issue isn't selling the Charter": rather, RWR wanted "to keep the Charter," but needed it "as an asset in order to raise money." *Id.* 1:53:40–1:54:07.

6. RWR's counsel further assured the Court that Legacy would not face irreparable harm because it could always purchase Charter #36 instead. Counsel represented that "Mr. Ware is standing by his consistent statement, all along, to sell Charter Number 36." *Id.* 1:52:30–1:53:02. According to RWR, "if [Legacy] want[s] a Charter, if they want Charter 36 in 2027, that's available." *Id.* 2:17:28–35.

7. Mr. Puchyr was well aware of the parties' dispute. He knew of the RWR Agreement that he helped broker. He knew that Legacy's position was that it had contracted with RWR to purchase a Charter, as reflected by the RWR Agreement. He also knew that RWR understood and confirmed that it had contracted to sell a Charter to Legacy such that Legacy would have one of RWR's Charters to own and operate no later than the 2027 season. He was even in the courtroom for the parties' hearing to hear RWR's representations, Legacy's first request for injunctive relief, and Legacy's concerns that RWR might take steps to unlawfully encumber one or more of its Charters.

² For the Court's convenience, Plaintiff Legacy is appending an unofficial transcript of excerpts from this proceeding as Exhibit A ("Ex. A") to this Complaint.

8. Despite Mr. Puchyr’s insider knowledge of the contract, his obligations under the Rucus Agreement, Legacy’s contractual right to a Charter from RWR, and RWR’s representations to this Court, Mr. Puchyr announced in June 2025 that he intended to purchase both of RWR’s Charters for himself. He declared to the press that, notwithstanding the active lawsuit between Legacy and RWR over resolving the terms of their deal, “there is no charter available from Ware for Legacy for either lease or purchase in 2026.” *Supra* n.1.

9. Mr. Puchyr’s public remarks did not stop there. He made personal attacks against Legacy owner and seven-time NASCAR champion and Hall of Famer Jimmie Johnson, claiming that he “d[idn’t] think Jimmie has all the facts, doesn’t understand the deal we had,” and “tried to humiliate Rick publicly.” *Supra* n.1. He further taunted that if Mr. Johnson “wants to sit down and talk about it like men, I’d entertain the conversation.” *Id.*

10. Rather than advocate for Legacy and its reputation, Mr. Puchyr publicly maligned his client and exploited his position of trust and his knowledge of the RWR Agreement to strike a backroom deal with the goal of depriving Legacy of the bargain that he helped put together.

11. Through his conduct, Mr. Puchyr materially breached the Rucus Agreement. Accordingly, Legacy terminated the Rucus Agreement shortly thereafter.

12. Mr. Puchyr and Rucus’s conduct constitutes tortious and unfair conduct that violates North Carolina law. The announced purchase violates the North Carolina Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices Act (“UDTPA”) because, on information and belief, Mr. Puchyr and Rucus concealed their intention to interfere with Legacy’s contractual rights for weeks and then maliciously and intentionally used insider knowledge and a position of trust to interfere with the RWR Agreement.

13. Defendants' conduct likewise amounts to tortious interference with contract by seeking to induce RWR to repudiate the RWR Agreement without any legitimate justification.

14. Finally, this conduct constitutes tortious interference with prospective economic advantage because it undermines Legacy's pending arrangements with sponsors, advertisers, and other third parties.

15. Legacy therefore brings this action to hold Mr. Puchyr and his company Rucus accountable for this misconduct.

PARTIES

16. Plaintiff RPAC Racing, LLC, d/b/a Legacy Motor Club, is a limited liability company incorporated under the laws of the State of Delaware. It maintains its registered office at 310 West Aviation Drive, Statesville, NC, 28677.

17. Defendant T.J. Puchyr is an individual who regularly conducts business in North Carolina as a broker for NASCAR-related transactions. Upon information and belief, Mr. Puchyr resides at 19533 Bustle Road, Cornelius, NC 28031.

18. Defendant Rucus Racing, LLC is a limited liability company incorporated under the laws of the State of North Carolina. It maintains its registered office at 19701 Bethel Church Road, Suite 103-109, Cornelius, NC 28031.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

19. This Court possesses subject matter jurisdiction over the Defendant under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 7A-243, as a civil suit in which the amount in controversy exceeds \$25,000.

20. This Court possesses personal jurisdiction over the Defendants under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-75.4(1), as both are domiciled in the State of North Carolina or are parties engaged in substantial activity within this State. In the alternative, this Court possesses personal jurisdiction

under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-75.4(3), as claims arise from Defendants' business activities in North Carolina.

21. Venue for this action is proper in Mecklenburg County, North Carolina under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 1-82, as the county where Defendants reside.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

I.

22. Until recently, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

23. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

24. Further, [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

25. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

26. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

27. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

II. Mr. Puchyr Brokers Legacy's Charter Purchase Agreement With RWR.

28. By January 2025, Legacy had begun working to identify a third NASCAR Cup Series Charter to expand its slate of cars and drivers.

29. These Charters provide NASCAR teams with valuable revenues and guarantee a spot in each race for the car associated with the Charter. Like other sports franchises, Cup Series Charters present prospective buyers with rare and invaluable business opportunities.

30. But finding the right Charter to purchase is an arduous process, given their limited number and the fact that most available Charters came with conditions that did not meet Legacy's needs.

31. Around that time, Legacy learned that RWR was facing financial pressure and needed to sell one of its two Charters. On RWR's behalf, Mr. Puchyr arranged for a meeting

between Legacy's CEO Calvin Wells III and RWR's owner Rick Ware to discuss a potential deal in exchange for a percentage of the sale price.

32. At this meeting, Legacy made clear that it wanted to purchase a Charter to expand its NASCAR presence. Over the next several weeks, Legacy and RWR negotiated a Charter purchase agreement, and on March 3, 2025, Legacy and RWR executed the RWR Agreement.

[REDACTED]

33. After signing the RWR Agreement, Legacy began taking steps to prepare for the 2026 season, including by reaching out to prospective sponsors, advertisers, and drivers for Legacy's third car.

34. On information and belief, Mr. Puchyr was aware of all of these preparations. He knew the fundamental terms of the RWR Agreement, and he knew Legacy's intentions and its position. Mr. Puchyr facilitated the parties' very first meeting, he continued to broker the parties' negotiations afterward, and he remained in communication with the parties as their deal took shape. He knew that Legacy expected to race a Charter under the RWR Agreement. Indeed, the very day after the deal was signed, on March 4, 2025, Mr. Wells spoke with Mr. Puchyr and conveyed that very same expectation to him.

III. A Dispute Arises Over The Charter Purchase Agreement.

35. After Legacy and RWR executed the RWR Agreement, a dispute arose over which of RWR's two Charters—#27 and #36—was the subject of the sale.

36. The RWR Agreement stated that [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] The RWR Agreement identified [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

37. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

38. Legacy subsequently pushed for more information, and Mr. Puchyr was aware of Mr. Ware's and RWR's positions—on the contract, and financially, too. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

39. [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

40. On April 1, 2025, Legacy filed suit against RWR in this Court (Case No. 25CV016837-590) and sought a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction to enforce its contractual rights under the RWR Agreement.

41. In opposing Legacy’s motion for preliminary injunction, RWR represented to Legacy and the Court that it would not sell either of its Charters. RWR’s owner Rick Ware stated in a declaration that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

42. RWR’s opposition brief asserted that [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

43. At the preliminary injunction hearing, RWR’s counsel likewise represented that RWR would never sell Charter #27 lest Rick Ware be put “out of business.” Rec. 1:12:26–1:12:32. RWR’s counsel also told this Court that an injunction would harm RWR, but “the issue isn’t selling the Charter”: rather, RWR wanted “to keep the Charter,” but needed it “as an asset in order to raise money.” *Id.* 1:53:40–1:54:07.

44. RWR’s counsel further stated that Legacy would not face irreparable harm if Charter #27 were encumbered because RWR recognized that it had struck a deal and, at minimum, would sell Charter #36 to Legacy. RWR’s counsel assured this Court that Legacy “will get their Charter”—“all they have to do is wait until 2027,” because “Mr. Ware is standing by his consistent

statement, all along, to sell Charter number 36.” *Id.* 1:52:30–1:53:02. According to RWR, “if [Legacy] want[s] a Charter, if they want Charter 36 in 2027, that’s available.” *Id.* 2:17:28–35.

45. Legacy relied on those representations to the Court, and continued to pursue its claims in good faith, understanding that at least one or both of the Charters would remain available while the Court determined the parties’ rights under the Agreement. Legacy had no reason to suspect that RWR’s representations were made in bad faith. It had even less reason to think that Mr. Puchyr would try to subvert Legacy after personally attending the April 30 hearing and witnessing RWR’s representations to the Court.

IV. Mr. Puchyr Announces Plans To Purchase RWR And Its NASCAR Charters.

46. After the Court denied Legacy’s motion for preliminary injunction, in part based on RWR’s and its counsel’s representations to Legacy and to the Court, Legacy learned through media reports that Mr. Puchyr has apparently sought to upend the RWR Agreement. On June 26, 2025, Puchyr announced in statements to the Associated Press that he had ostensibly made a deal to buy both of RWR’s two Charters.³

47. According to Mr. Puchyr, his intended purchase would mean that neither of RWR’s Charters would be available to Legacy, notwithstanding RWR’s express assurances to the Court to the contrary and the fact that Mr. Puchyr himself brokered the deal with Legacy.

48. On information and belief, Mr. Puchyr’s announcement of his attempt to purchase RWR and its Charters was not an overnight development. Mr. Puchyr in fact executed an agreement purporting to purchase RWR and its Charters on June 4, after sending Mr. Ware a Letter of Intent to purchase both Charters. NASCAR Cup Series Charter purchases are complex transactions for rare commercial opportunities worth tens of millions of dollars, and the \$150

³ *See supra* note 1.

million price that Mr. Puchyr’s proposed to pay was without precedent. On information and belief, Mr. Puchyr spent weeks preparing, negotiating, and presumably securing financing for his prospective purchase of RWR and its Charters—securing millions of dollars from as-yet unknown entities and/or individuals in the process.

49. In his announcement, Mr. Puchyr further declared that Legacy’s owner, NASCAR legend Jimmie Johnson, “doesn’t understand the deal we had” and does not have “all the facts.” His reference to “the deal we had” raises serious conflicts and ethics concerns, beyond suggesting a behind-the-scenes interest in RWR that was not previously disclosed.

50. This would violate the Rucus Agreement, which required Rucus and TJ to acquire and maintain a sponsorship relationship with Legacy and contained confidentiality terms. Mr. Puchyr’s announced plan to purchase RWR and his statements to the press that disparage Legacy and its owners squarely breach those terms.

51. Legacy moved to redress this series of betrayals. On July 15, 2025, Legacy provided written notice to Mr. Puchyr and Rucus that it was terminating the Rucus Agreement. That same day, Legacy filed its first Complaint against Mr. Puchyr for tortious interference with contract and prospective economic advantage, and for violation of the North Carolina Unfair and Deceptive Trade Practices Act. *See* Index No. 1, ¶¶ 51–71.

52. Shortly thereafter, Legacy again moved for a preliminary injunction against RWR, contending that the intended deal between Mr. Puchyr and RWR contradicted RWR’s and its counsel’s prior representations to Legacy and to the Court.

53. On August 22, 2025, the Court granted the motion for preliminary injunction, enjoining RWR from selling either of the Charters to Puchyr.

54. Ultimately, Legacy and RWR reached a confidential settlement, and Legacy dismissed its claims against RWR with prejudice on or about November 20, 2025.

55. Although the preliminary injunction blocked the intended deal between Puchyr and RWR, Puchyr's wrongful attempt to deprive Legacy of the Charter it had contracted to purchase caused substantial harm to Legacy.

56. Legacy therefore brings this case to recover its damages for Mr. Puchyr's unlawful disregard for Legacy's rights.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE WITH CONTRACT

57. Legacy incorporates herein by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth in this paragraph.

58. A valid and enforceable contract existed between Legacy and RWR for the purchase of a NASCAR Charter.

59. Mr. Puchyr and Rucus had actual knowledge of the RWR Agreement.

60. Mr. Puchyr and Rucus intentionally induced RWR to breach the RWR Agreement.

61. Mr. Puchyr and Rucus acted without justification and with malice, as evidenced by, among other things: (1) Mr. Puchyr's statement that Legacy will be unable to purchase or lease any Charter from RWR despite RWR's prior statements; (2) [REDACTED]; (3) Defendants' violation of the Rucus Agreement.

62. As a direct and proximate result of Mr. Puchyr's and Rucus's interference, RWR breached the RWR Agreement, causing Legacy substantial damages, in an amount to be determined at trial.

63. Mr. Puchyr's conduct was willful and malicious, entitling Legacy to punitive damages.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE
WITH PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC ADVANTAGE

64. Legacy incorporates herein by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth in this paragraph.

65. Legacy had a reasonable expectation of entering valid business relationships sponsors and other third parties in the interest of preparing to field a third car in 2026 and 2027.

66. On information and belief, Mr. Puchyr and Rucus had knowledge of these prospective business relationships.

67. On information and belief, Mr. Puchyr and Rucus purposely and without justification interfered with these relationships by announcing a prospective purchase of RWR and its Charters, and publicly stating that due to his intended purchase Legacy would not have any opportunity to acquire a Charter from RWR in 2026 or 2027.

68. Mr. Puchyr's and Rucus's interference prevented Legacy from making contracts with prospective sponsors by clouding the certainty that Legacy would be able run a third car under the Charter it bought from RWR in 2026 or 2027. It thus deprived Legacy prospective business relationships with sponsors and others, causing Legacy substantial damages in an amount to be determined at trial.

69. Mr. Puchyr's and Rucus's conduct was willful and malicious, entitling Legacy to punitive damages.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
VIOLATION OF NORTH CAROLINA UNFAIR AND DECEPTIVE TRADE
PRACTICES ACT

70. Legacy incorporates herein by reference the preceding paragraphs of this Complaint as if fully set forth in this paragraph.

71. Defendants' conduct constitutes unfair and deceptive trade practices in violation of N.C. Gen. Stat. §§ 75-1.1, *et seq.*

72. Mr. Puchyr and Rucus Racing engaged in conduct in or affecting commerce by acting as a broker in NASCAR-related transactions and by purchasing RWR and its NASCAR Charters.

73. Mr. Puchyr's conduct was deceptive and unfair in that Mr. Puchyr, on information and belief, either through Rucus or in his personal capacity: (1) spent weeks raising millions in debt and/or equity financing to purchase RWR and its Charters, despite the fact that Legacy is owed one Charter under the RWR Agreement Mr. Puchyr brokered; (2) concealed his intention to interfere with Legacy's contractual rights for weeks during a lawsuit to enforce those rights; (3) exploited his knowledge of the RWR Agreement and Legacy's lawsuit to structure a proposed transaction to best fit his own and RWR's interests while violating Legacy's rights; (4) orchestrated a proposed deal to purchase RWR that contradicted RWR's in-court representations, its owner's sworn written statements, and its counsel's representations in court; (5) sought to use unfair methods of competition with the intent to harm Legacy and put it at a competitive disadvantage, including by leveraging Legacy's dispute with RWR to enter the NASCAR Cup Series on the back

of a proposed purchase of Legacy's rightful Charter; and (6) misused Legacy's confidential information for personal gain.

74. Mr. Puchyr's and Rucus's intention to purchase RWR and its Charters under these circumstances offends public policy and is immoral, unethical, oppressive, unscrupulous, and substantially injurious to Legacy.

75. Mr. Puchyr's and Rucus's unfair and deceptive acts proximately caused actual injury to Legacy in an amount to be determined at trial.

76. Legacy is entitled to treble damages under N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-16.

77. Legacy is entitled to attorneys' fees pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-16.1.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Legacy respectfully prays the Court to grant the following relief:

1. That the Court award Legacy actual damages in an amount to be proven at trial;
3. That the Court award Legacy treble damages pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-16;
4. That the Court award Legacy punitive damages for Mr. Puchyr's and Rucus's willful and malicious conduct.
5. That the Court award Legacy its costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees pursuant to N.C. Gen. Stat. § 75-16.1 and other applicable law; and
6. That the Court grant such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

This the 5th day of February, 2026.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Lee M. Whitman

Lee M. Whitman

NC Bar No. 20193

D. Scott Hazelgrove, II

NC Bar No. 57618

WYRICK ROBBINS YATES & PONTON, LLP

Email: keithforst@quinnemanuel.com
Email: paulhenderson@quinnemanuel.com

Justin C. Griffin (*pro hac vice pending*)
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
865 S. Figueroa St., 10th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Phone: (213) 443-3000
Fax: (213) 443-3100
Email: justingriffin@quinnemanuel.com

4101 Lake Boone Trail, Suite 300
Raleigh, North Carolina 27607
Telephone: (919) 791-4000
Facsimile: (919) 781-4865
lwhitman@wyrick.com
shazelgrove@wyrick.com

Alex Spiro (*pro hac vice pending*)
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
295 5th Avenue, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10016
Phone: (212) 849-7000
Fax: (212) 849-7100
Email: alexspiro@quinnemanuel.com

Keith H. Forst (*pro hac vice pending*)
Paul D. Henderson (*pro hac vice pending*)
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &
SULLIVAN, LLP
555 13th Street NW, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: (202) 538-8000
Fax: (202) 538-8100
Attorneys for Plaintiff Legacy Motor Club

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned counsel hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing pleading was served this day via electronic mail addressed as follows:

Carrie E. Meigs
Matthew B. Couch
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP
4509 Creedmoor Road, Suite 501
Raleigh, North Carolina 27612
cemeigs@michaelbest.com

Counsel for Defendants

This the 5th day of February, 2026.

/s/ Lee M. Whitman
Lee M. Whitman

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned counsel hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing redacted pleading was served this day via electronic mail addressed as follows:

Austin A. Backus
Carrie E. Meigs
Matthew B. Couch
MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH
LLP 4509 Creedmoor Road, Suite 501
Raleigh, North Carolina 27612
austin.backus@michaelbest.com
cemeigs@michaelbest.com
matt.couch@michaelbest.com

Counsel for Defendant T.J. Puchyr

This the 13th day of February, 2026.

/s/ Lee M. Whitman
Lee M. Whitman