

**Arizona Supreme Court**  
**Civil Petition for Review - Special Action**

**CV-26-0098-PR**

**WISNOWSKI et al v KOMPOS**

**Appellate Case Information**

Case Filed: 27-Mar-2026  
Case Closed:

**Dept/Composition**

**Side 1. WISNOWSKI, INC., et al., Petitioner**

(Litigant Group) WISNOWSKI, INC., et al.

- Wisnowski Inc
- 1215 SR LLC
- 1137 SR LLC
- Todd Borowsky

**Attorneys for: Petitioner**

Dennis I Wilenchik, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 5350)  
Lisa M Borowsky, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 15392)

**Side 2. DIMITRIS KOMPOS, an individual, Respondent**

(Litigant Group) DIMITRIS KOMPOS, an individual

- Dimitris Kompos

**Attorneys for: Respondent**

Cody J Jess, Esq. (AZ Bar No. 25066)

**CASE STATUS**

Mar 27, 2026....Pending

PREDECESSOR CASE (S)	Cause/Charge/Class	Judgment/Sentence	Judge, Role <Comments>	Trial	Dispo
1 CA	1 CA-SA 26-0080				
↳ MAR	CV2023-019786		Erik Thorson, Authoring Judge of Order Comments: (none)		

**6 PROCEEDING ENTRIES**

1. 27-Mar-2026 FILED: Petition for Review; Certificate of Service; Certificate of Compliance; Order Declining Special Action Jurisdiction (Petitioners Wisnowski, et al.)
2. 27-Mar-2026 FILED: Appendix; Certificate of Service (Petitioners Wisnowski, et al.)
3. 2-Apr-2026 FILED: Motion for Stay of Proceedings; Certificate of Service (Petitioners Wisnowski, et al.)
4. 6-Apr-2026 On April 2, 2026, Petitioners/Defendants Wisnowski, Inc. and Todd Borowsky filed a Motion for Stay of Proceedings. To obtain a stay, a movant must show (among other things) a "strong likelihood of success on the merits"; "irreparable harm if the stay is not granted"; and "the harm to the requesting party outweighs the harm to the party opposing the stay." Smith v. Ariz. Citizens Clean Elections Comm'n, 212 Ariz. 407, 410 ¶¶ 10 (2006). Petitioners/Defendants have not made the requisite showing to grant the motion.

As to likelihood of success, the motion devotes only three paragraphs to the merits and merely reasserts Petitioners/Defendants' contentions without any legal reasoning or citation to authority. [Motion at 2] It also does not address the reasons the superior court gave for granting relief for Respondent/Plaintiff and for rejecting the Petitioners/Defendants' position.

Petitioners/Defendants also fail to demonstrate irreparable harm if a stay is not granted. They argue a stay is necessary because Respondent/Plaintiff has asked for the appointment of a receiver and the court has set an evidentiary hearing on that request for April 16, 2026. [Motion at 1] But, at this point, it is speculative whether the court will actually appoint a receiver. Moreover, Petitioners/Defendants fail to show how the appointment of a receiver will cause them irreparable harm. All they say is that "[s]uch an appointment would cause irreversible harm to the business and its management," but they never elaborate. [Motion at 3]

Petitioners/Defendants also fail to show that any harm to them if a stay is denied outweighs the harm to Respondent/Plaintiff if a stay is granted. Imposing a stay would leave Respondent/Plaintiff's alleged property interest in the company unprotected and subject to possible misuse. In contrast, granting a stay does not diminish Petitioner/Defendant Borowsky's interest in the company or necessarily interfere with the company's legitimate business activities.

In sum, upon consideration,  
IT IS ORDERED denying the Motion for Stay of Proceedings. (Hon William G Montgomery)

5. 9-Apr-2026 RECEIPT No.: 2026-00106 ; \$330.00, Authorization: 8656516847050262, Applied to: WISNOWSKI, INC., et al. - Class A Filing Fee (\$330.00) Paid for: WISNOWSKI, INC., et al. - By nCourt LLC
6. 9-Apr-2026 FILED: Record From CofA: Electronic Record