

v. Whitehall Venture, 39 Md. App. 197 (1978). The most recent approach taken by the Maryland appellate courts has focused on what has been termed the "balance of convenience" doctrine, i.e. the benefits to the plaintiff must be equal to or outweigh the potential harm which the defendant may incur if the injunction is granted. TJB, Inc. v. Arundel Bedding Co., 63 Md. App. 186 (1985); Rowe v. C & P Telephone Co., 56 Md. App. 23 (1983); State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene v. Baltimore County, 281 Md. 548 (1977). Also of importance in determining whether or not an injunction shall issue is the likelihood that the plaintiff will succeed on the merits, whether the plaintiff will suffer irreparable injury without the injunction and the public interest. TJB, Inc., *supra*; Rowe, *supra*. Plaintiff has not shown any compelling reason under any of the factors above in the circumstances of this case to warrant the extraordinary remedy of an injunction.

Plaintiff alleges in her Complaint to Quiet Title and/or to Establish Title by Adverse Possession and for Injunctive Relief that the Defendant's repeated and continuous interference with the Plaintiff's possession of the Disputed Area has caused and will continue to cause substantial, immediate and irreparable injury. Specifically, Plaintiff complains that Defendant's lessee, Paul Sill, has parked a large truck on the Disputed Area taking up much of the space which Plaintiff's tenants had theretofore used as off street parking space, and that should she be unable to provide such off street parking she stands to lose tenants and to have