


and enjoin Plaintiff from levying against Defendants' personal assets. [23]

Plaintiff opposes the injunction as a violation of the Anti-Injunction Act, stating that, an injunction halting a state court proceeding is inappropriate, "except as expressly authorized by Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments." 28 U.S.C. § 2283.

After a review of the record and a hearing held on March 10, 2009, the Court finds that an injunction would be inappropriate given the expressed constraints of the Anti-Injunction Act. Accordingly, Defendants' Motion for a Preliminary Injunction [23] is **DENIED**.

The Court further finds that expedited discovery is appropriate in this case. The parties are **DIRECTED** to confer in an effort to agree upon an expedited discovery schedule. If the parties are not able to submit a stipulated schedule to the Court within five (5) days, each party shall submit a proposed schedule to the Court, and the Court will set the schedule.

SO ORDERED this 10th day of March, 2009.



RICHARD W. STORY
United States District Judge