fair. Finally, Defendants, consistent with this Court's earlier order to preserve evidence, should be required to preserve and protect the vehicle that Plaintiffs recently traded in until Plaintiffs have the opportunity to have an expert review and examine the car.

The procedural posture of this case does not prevent this Court from taking action. Plaintiffs are aware that a petition is pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation seeking to consolidate cases involving similar claims. However, even if a party should request a stay pending action by the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation, this Court is not compelled to refrain from proceeding with the case. *See Burton v. William Beaumont Hospital*, 347 F.Supp.2d 486, 490 (E.D Mich. 2004) (denying motion to stay pending outcome of hearing before Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation).

The urgency for this court to proceed with the injunctive relief is enormous. Plaintiffs have demonstrated that Defendants are creating a clear and present danger. Absent immediate action by this Court, Ohio residents not only will continue to suffer economic loss; they will suffer a real likelihood of further injuries and possibly death.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons contained in this motion and memorandum, this Court should grant Plaintiffs' Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order or Preliminary Injunction and Order that:

(1) Defendants immediately begin to install brake over ride systems for all Ohio residents with Toyota Vehicles with Electronic Throttle Control;

(2) Defendants may not modify or alter the car formerly owned by Mr. and Mrs. Kamphaus until Plaintiffs have the opportunity to have an expert examine the car;

(3) Defendants immediately must provide alternative vehicles for all Ohio residents who currently own or lease Toyota vehicles; and

(4) Defendants, until further notice, may not collect car payments from Ohio residents.