

considerable difficulty in re-leasing the property for the same rent she is now realizing. Plaintiff, upon information and belief, has not lost any tenants due to the unavailability of off street parking space allegedly caused by Mr. Sill's truck being parked on the Disputed Area. In fact, Mr. Sill has gone to the effort of clearing out a substantial amount of brush at the end of the Disputed Area to enable the truck to be parked further back from the Plaintiff's adjoining parking lot and to permit Plaintiff's tenants free and unobstructed access from the parking lot to the public alley. Additionally, Plaintiff's parking lot is sufficient in and of itself to accommodate four (4) vehicles and there is accordingly no need for her tenants to have to search "...elsewhere for parking spaces at a possible additional expense." (Plaintiff's memorandum, pg. 5). Under these circumstances, the balance of convenience clearly favors the Defendant who, if an injunction is granted, will be denied the use of his property to park his truck, which use does not adversely affect the ability of Plaintiff's tenants to park in Plaintiff's existing off street parking lot. The hardships which Plaintiff alleges will result if an injunction is denied, i.e. extreme dissatisfaction and possible defection of her tenants and a corresponding diminution in the value of her property, are purely speculative and unsupported by the current situation. In sum, Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate the quantum and quality of likely harm which would justify this Court issuing an injunction.