

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

Preliminary Innovation Standard

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]


[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]









services to which defendant Accent referred its customers.<sup>10</sup> Also, some but not all of Accent's

instant injunction to preserve the defendants' assets for redress of such injured parties, and also to prevent further injury to other consumers through continued fraud. The unfair and deceptive practices of which the FTC has offered evidence permeate the defendants' business dealings, so that it is impracticable to craft restrictions sufficiently broad to prevent further such practices and

~~resultant injury to the public, while nevertheless allowing the defendants to continue to operate their business.~~

[REDACTED]



public and private, weigh in favor of issuance of the preliminary injunction.

Conclusion

[REDACTED]