

to prevent attempts to remove property from the state, to fraudulently convey property or to conceal property, in order to protect the payment of alimony and support. The requested injunction in this case does not come within the statute.

A prejudgment common law injunction may be obtained only upon the showing of: 1) a clear legal right; 2) the substantial likelihood of immediate irreparable harm; 3) the lack of an adequate remedy at law; and 4) consideration of the public interest. Permitting the use of the marital vehicles by a non-family member who is not adequately insured by the parties would appear to be exceedingly imprudent, but the Court does not find that Charlie's Hill's use of the vehicles would constitute "substantial likelihood of immediate irreparable harm". At most, it is speculation that liability could result. Moreover, Respondent has not shown that he lacks an adequate remedy at law. See *Esposito v Horning*, 416 So.2d 896 (Fla. 4th DCA 1982). See also, *Weinstein v Aisenberg*, 758 So.2d 705 (Fla. 4th DCA 2000). Therefore, it is

ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that Petitioner's motion for an injunction is DENIED.

DONE AND ORDERED in Chambers, at Clearwater, Pinellas County, Florida, this 30 day of April 2009.


GEORGE W. GREER
CIRCUIT JUDGE

Copies furnished to:
Ann Loughridge Kerr, Esq, 425 S Garden Avenue, Clearwater, FL 34616
Raymond J Rafool, Esq, 95 Merrick Way, Suite 610, Coral Gables, FL 33134