Summary of SC101187, *Glendale Shooting Club Inc. v. William K. Landolt and Jeri J. Landolt*

Appeal from the Franklin County circuit court, Judge Craig F. Hellmann
Argued and submitted May 27, 2026; opinion issued July 21, 2026

Attorneys: The homeowners were represented by David L. Baylard of Baylard, Billington, Jensen, Struzzi & Piontek PC in Union, (636) 583-5103. Glendale was represented by David R. Bohn, an attorney in St. Louis, (314) 726-1000. The state was represented by Louis J. Capozzi III, Samuel C. Freedlund, and Ryan Dugan of the attorney general's office in Jefferson City, (573) 751-3321.

This summary is not part of the opinion of the Court. It is provided by communications counsel for the convenience of the reader. It neither has been reviewed nor approved by the Supreme Court and should not be quoted or cited.

Overview: Homeowners appeal a circuit court's judgment dissolving a permanent injunction against a neighboring firing range. In a unanimous decision written by Judge Mary R. Russell, the Supreme Court of Missouri affirms the judgment. Although the circuit court misstated the law in holding a statutory change alone made it unfair to continue enforcing the injunction, it correctly considered the facts and equities in alternatively holding there no longer was a nuisance given how much sound barriers and berms around the shooting ranges reduced gunfire noise.

Facts: In 1976, Glendale Shooting Club Inc. acquired property immediately adjacent to a couple's property. The couple sued Glendale, alleging daily shooting noise constituted a nuisance. The circuit court agreed, entering a permanent injunction limiting the shooting allowable at the club. After further litigation, the parties entered into a settlement agreement precluding any further litigation between the parties for 20 years. After the prohibition period expired, Glendale sought to dissolve the permanent injunction, alleging it no longer was equitable to enforce the injunction given physical changes made to the shooting range and the enactment of a statute providing immunity to firearm ranges for nuisance and trespass actions. By this time, the adjacent property was owned by William Landolt and Jeri Cashin (the homeowners). Ultimately, the circuit court determined continued enforcement of the injunction was inequitable. The homeowners appeal.

AFFIRMED.

Court en banc holds: The circuit court did not abuse its discretion in dissolving the permanent injunction. Because this is an action in equity, the circuit court properly found the homeowners had no right to a jury trial. There are only limited, narrow exceptions allowing a party to obtain relief from a final judgment such as a permanent injunction. The circuit court had to weigh the equities in the case to determine whether they warranted relief from the permanent injunction. The circuit court plainly misstated the law in finding the statutory change "in and of itself" rendered continued enforcement of the 1987 injunction inequitable. But it properly weighed the equities in alternatively holding that the changed circumstances to Glendale's property – sound barriers around the shooting ranges that reduced the noise level – rendered continued enforcement of the injunction inequitable.