

interest.: Fed R Civ P 65(a); *International Dairy Foods Association v Boggs*, 622 F3d 628, 635 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 2010).

The four considerations are not meant to be “prerequisites that must be satisfied” or “rigid and unbending requirements.” *In re Eagle-Picher Industries, Inc*, 963 F2d 855, 859 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 1992). Rather, the factors should be balanced and used as to guide the discretion of the court. *Id*; *Friendship Materials, Inc v Michigan Brick, Inc*, 679 F2d 100, 102 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir 1982).

#### **b. Application**

Likelihood of Success. Plaintiff s Motion and supporting brief struggle to rise above the level of gibberish consisting of a lengthy diatribe peppered with conclusory statements of law, none of which are relevant to Defendants. He makes no serious effort to demonstrate that it is likely he will succeed on the merits of his claims against Defendants.

That he broadcasts his disagreement with the manner in which he is obligated to satisfy his child support responsibilities is wholly immaterial because the ~~United States District Court is without jurisdiction to amend,~~ change, alter, or excuse Plaintiff’s support obligation, assuming *arguendo*, it was in fact unlawfully imposed at all.

In this regard, ~~the Rooker-Feldman doctrine~~ stands for the unremarkable proposition that a federal district court lacks subject matter