

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION**

WILLIAM A. MUNCK, SUZANNE T. §
MUNCK, and WILLIAM P.J. MUNCK, §
Plaintiffs, §

v. §

Case No. 4:14-cv-173

DALLAS LACROSSE ACADEMY, LLC, §
d/b/a COAST2COAST LACROSSE d/b/a §C2C §
LACROSSE and d/b/a MAVERICK §
LACROSSE ACADEMY, JOHN A. §
MARANO, KEVIN BARNICLE, §
ALEXANDER POOLE, CHRISTOPHER §
VAN DORN, ROBERT SEEBOLD, and §
STEVEN KRAVIT, §
Defendants. §

**ORDER DENYING JOINT MOTION FOR ENTRY OF A
STIPULATED PERMANENT INJUNCTION (DKT. 28)**

Pending before the court is the parties’ Joint Motion for Entry of a Stipulated Permanent Injunction and Order of Dismissal (Dkt. 28). The parties inform the court that they have reached a settlement agreement, which includes the issuance by the court of the “Stipulated Permanent Injunction and Order of Dismissal” attached to their joint motion. Dkt. 28-1. The permanent injunction sought by the parties seeks to prevent Defendants from “directly or indirectly committing or conspiring to commit any act(s) constituting a violation of the Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations Act, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1961-1968, against William A. Munck, Suzanne T. Munck, William P.J. Munck, and Garrett J. Munck” for three years. Dkt. 28-1 ¶¶ 1-2.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(d) requires “[e]very order granting an injunction and every restraining order” to “(A) state the reasons why it issued; (B) state its terms specifically; and (C) describe in reasonable detail—and not by referring to the complaint or other document—the act or acts restrained or required.” “A general injunction which in essence orders a defendant

to obey the law is not permitted.” *Meyer v. Brown & Root Const. Co.*, 661 F.2d 369, 373 (5th Cir. 1981). “[The] command of specificity is a reflection of the seriousness of the consequences which may flow from a violation of an injunctive order.” *Payne v. Travenol Labs., Inc.*, 565 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1978), *cert denied*, 439 U.S. 835 (1978). The proposed order and injunction is not sufficiently descriptive of the conduct to be prohibited. The parties may file an amended motion. The parties’ Joint Motion for Entry of a Stipulated Permanent Injunction and Order of Dismissal (Dkt. 28) is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SIGNED this the 11th day of December, 2014.



RICHARD A. SCHELL
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE