¶ The Ct has BY it a pleading ~~an order~~ entitled "Emergency motion for injunction pending appeal" and upon consideration thereof and the opposition thereto and ~~this~~ this Ct's understanding that π's appeal from this Ct's opinion and order of yesterday denying π's injunctive relief has been withdrawn the Court, for the reasons hereinafter set forth, will deny π's application for a stay pending appeal.

¶ The π's have known for approximately two months that they could well be required under the Foreign Missions Act to close down the Palestine Liberation Organization's Information Office (PIO) in Washington, D.C. Moreover, the Ct has considered and found that the Foreign Missions Act was properly applied by the Δ's in this case and that π's have shown no likelihood of success under that statute or the Constitution. Also this Ct finds that the claims asserted here do not even present a "substantial question" and as the U.S. Ct of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit observed in Jimenez v. Barber in 1958 that grant of a stay, when there is a lack of a s.q. would be improper. 252 F2d 550 (9th Cir. 1958). It is also well settled that a motion such as the instant one requires ~~more than~~ a showing of more than a reasonable probability of success on the merits and a higher standard or a "stronger showing" than would be the case in the first instance, ~~for~~ that a court must ~~to~~ consider in deciding whether to grant or deny preliminary injunctive relief Bayless v Martine 430 F2d 873, 879 (5th Cir. 1970).