

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

Gridkor, LLC, et al. v. William Collins, et al.

Gridkor · No. Civil No. 5:23-cv-03563-JLS · Decided February 5, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania finds Jonathan Jacobs in civil contempt for knowingly aiding and facilitating violations of a preliminary injunction by defendants William Collins and Igor Gorbach. The court concludes that Jacobs requested and received \$500,000 in payments despite knowing that the injunction prohibited the other defendants from dissipating assets, and that he prepared an agreement seeking additional payments. The court orders Jacobs to remit the \$500,000, plus interest and reasonable attorneys’ fees.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jeffrey L. Schmehl
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania
DECIDED	February 5, 2026
DOCKET	Civil No. 5:23-cv-03563-JLS
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiffs renewed a motion to show cause seeking a finding that Defendant Jonathan Jacobs was in civil contempt for violating a preliminary injunction. After an evidentiary hearing and supplemental briefing, the court found Jacobs in contempt and ordered monetary relief.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The movant must establish civil contempt by clear and convincing evidence by proving that a valid court order existed, the alleged contemnor had knowledge of the order, and the alleged contemnor disobeyed the order. Ambiguities are resolved in favor of the person charged with contempt. Willfulness is not required, and good faith is not a defense.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown; district court memorandum opinion with no reporter citation in the source.

PARTIES

Gridkor, LLC, et al. v. William Collins, et al.

TOPICS

contempt

injunctions

remedies

attorney fees

civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

commercial litigation

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Jacobs, a person carved out of the preliminary injunction but aware that it remained in effect as to other defendants, aided and abetted those defendants in violating the injunction by requesting and facilitating payments from them.
2. Whether Plaintiffs proved the elements of civil contempt by clear and convincing evidence.
3. What compensatory or coercive relief was appropriate for Jacobs's contempt.

HOLDINGS

1. A person who knowingly aids or abets an enjoined party in violating an injunction may be held in civil contempt, even if that person is not independently subject to the injunction's operative restriction.
2. Plaintiffs proved by clear and convincing evidence that Jacobs was in civil contempt of the September 18, 2023 Preliminary Injunction Order.
3. The court may award compensatory relief consisting of the \$500,000 obtained through the injunction violation, interest, and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in enforcing the injunction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A movant must prove “three elements by clear and convincing evidence to establish that a party is liable for civil contempt: (1) that a valid order of the court existed; (2) that the defendants had knowledge of the order; and (3) that the defendants disobeyed the order.”” (Discussion)

“The critical fact is that Jacobs was not acting independently but was acting to facilitate and assist the enjoined parties, Gorbach and Collins, in violating the September 18, 2023 Preliminary Injunction Order by dissipating their assets by making payments to Jacobs.” (Discussion)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The court's preliminary injunction prohibited the defendants other than Jacobs from transferring assets outside the ordinary course of business or ordinary household expenses until adequate security was posted. Jacobs knew that the injunction remained in effect as to Gorbach, Collins, and Maydanskyy, yet requested payments from Collins and Gorbach and drafted an agreement seeking \$3.17 million in repayments. Collins and Gorbach ultimately transferred a total of \$500,000 to Jacobs through their companies, and the court found that the payments were not ordinary business or household expenses and that Jacobs's conduct facilitated the enjoined defendants' dissipation of assets.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The court issued a preliminary injunction on September 18, 2023, restricting asset transfers by the defendants. The injunction was later modified as to Jacobs, who was prohibited from reducing his net worth below \$837,500, while the original injunction remained in effect as to the other defendants. Plaintiffs' initial contempt motion was denied without prejudice; they renewed the motion against Jacobs, and the court held a hearing on October 3, 2025 before granting relief.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Marshak v. Treadwell, 595 F.3d 478, 485-86 (3d Cir. 2009)
- Roe v. Operation Rescue, 54 F.3d 133, 137, 140 (3d Cir. 1995)
- John T. ex rel. Paul T. v. Delaware County Intermediate Unit, 318 F.3d 545, 552 (3d Cir. 2003)
- Harley-Davidson, Inc. v. Morris, 19 F.3d 142, 148-49 (3d Cir. 1994)
- Max's Seafood Cafe ex rel. Lou-Ann, Inc. v. Quinteros, 176 F.3d 669, 674 (3d Cir. 1999)
- Havens v. James, 76 F.4th 103, 115-16 (2d Cir. 2023)
- Goya Foods, Inc. v. Wallack Management Co., 290 F.3d 63, 75 (1st Cir. 2002)
- Waffenschmidt v. MacKay, 763 F.2d 711, 714-15 (5th Cir. 1985)
- Alemite Manufacturing Corp. v. Staff, 42 F.2d 832, 832-33 (2d Cir. 1930)
- Eli Lilly & Co. v. Gottstein, 617 F.3d 186, 193 (2d Cir. 2010)
- Quinter v. Volkswagen of America, 676 F.2d 969, 975 (3d Cir. 1982)