

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2024-091435

04/07/2026

HONORABLE GREG S. COMO

CLERK OF THE COURT  
C. Lacey  
Deputy

ARIZONA SILVERADO CONDOMINIUM  
ASSOCIATION

ELIZABETH LINDBLOM

v.

NICK LENTZOS, et al.

NICK LENTZOS  
24887 SPRINGBROOK DR  
FARMINGTON HILLS MI 48336

MARIA PAPAS  
24887 SPRINGBROOK  
FARMINGTON HILL MI 48336  
VASILIKI PAPPAS  
23244 MONTCLAIR ST  
FARMINGTON HILL MI 48336  
CITY OF SCOTTSDALE  
7447 E INDIAN SCHOOL RD # 210  
SCOTTSDALE AZ 85251  
DOCKET CV TX  
EDM-QC-CCC  
JUDGE COMO

MINUTE ENTRY

Pending before the Court are:

1. Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Defendant Maia Papas' Answer, filed on 2-19-2026; and
2. Defendant Papas' Motion for Partial Dismissal, filed on 3-22-2026.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA  
MARICOPA COUNTY

CV 2024-091435

04/07/2026

The Court has reviewed both motions and the response briefs. The Court finds that oral argument is not necessary to resolve the motions.

**Motion to Strike**

Plaintiff moves to strike Maria Papas' answer that was filed on 2-12-2026. Plaintiff argues that the Answer does not meet the procedural requirements of Rule 8(c) because it does not admit or deny each of the allegations in the First Amended Complaint.

Ms. Papas has filed two answers to the First Amended Complaint. The first one was filed on October 15, 2025. In that answer she issued a general denial to the allegation in the Complaint.

Although Ms. Papas' pleadings have been somewhat confusing, the Court does not find a basis to strike her Answer(s). Plaintiff's motion to strike is denied.

**Motion for Partial Dismissal**

Ms. Papas' motion for partial dismissal seeks to dismiss "the claims asserted against her in her individual capacity." The motion, however, is inconsistent and contradictory. In the same motion, she seeks to assert counterclaims that were not pled in her Answer. She also objects to default proceedings that do not apply to her and asks to "remain as a named Defendant and interested party."

Plaintiff's response to the motion notes the above inconsistencies. Plaintiff also states that Ms. Papas was only named in the First Amended Complaint because she claims to be an heir to The Estate of Nick Lentzos. Ms. Papas' motion attaches, as Exhibit A, Letters of Authority for Personal Representative. The Letters indicate Vasiliki Pappas is the personal representative of The Estate of Nick Lentzos. Plaintiff asks that Ms. Papas be dismissed from the case entirely.

The Court agrees with Plaintiff that there is no basis for Ms. Papas to remain in the case. Accordingly,

**IT IS ORDERED:**

1. Denying Plaintiff's Motion to strike Maria Papas' Answer.
2. Dismissing Maria Papas from the case entirely.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** directing Clerk of Court, Docket personnel, to remove the dismissed **Maria Papas** only, referenced above from the caption of this case.