in statutory language,[1298] or through Court interpretation.[1299] The Court's general policy of application, however, seems to a considerable degree to effectuate what is now at least the major rationale of the statute, deference to state court adjudication of issues presented to them for decision.[1300]

Res Judicata.—Both the Constitution and a contemporaneously enacted statute require federal courts to give "full faith and credit" to state court judgments, to give, that is, preclusive effect to state court judgments when those judgments would be given preclusive effect by the courts of that state.[1301] The present Court views the interpretation of "full faith and credit" in the overall context of deference to state courts running throughout this section. "Thus, *res judicata* and collateral estoppel not only reduce unnecessary litigation and foster reliance on adjudication, but also promote the comity between state and federal courts that has been recognized as a bulwark of the federal system."[1302] 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is not an

---

[1298] The greatest difficulty is with the "expressly authorized by Act of Congress" exception. No other Act of Congress expressly refers to § 2283 and the Court has indicated that no such reference is necessary to create a statutory exception. Amalgamated Clothing Workers v. Richman Bros., 348 U.S. 511, 516 (1955). *Compare* Capital Service, Inc. v. NLRB, 347 U.S. 501 (1954). Rather, "in order to qualify as an 'expressly authorized' exception to the anti-injunction statute, an Act of Congress must have created a specific and uniquely federal right or remedy, enforceable in a federal court of equity, that could be frustrated if the federal court were not empowered to enjoin a state court proceeding." Mitchum v. Foster, 407 U.S. 225, 237 (1972). Applying this test, the Court in *Mitchum* held that a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 suit is an exception to § 2283 and that persons suing under this authority may, if they satisfy the requirements of comity, obtain an injunction against state court proceedings. The exception is, of course, highly constrained by the comity principle. On the difficulty of applying the test, *see* Vendo Co. v. Lektco-Vend Corp., 433 U.S. 623 (1977) (fragmented Court on whether Clayton Act authorization of private suits for injunctive relief is an "expressly authorized" exception to § 2283).

On the interpretation of the § 2283 exception for injunctions to protect or effectuate a federal-court judgment, *see* Chick Kam Choo v. Exxon Corp., 486 U.S. 140 (1988).

[1299] Thus, the Act bars federal court restraint of pending state court proceedings but not restraint of the institution of such proceedings. Dombrowski v. Pfister, 380 U.S. 479, 484 n.2 (1965). Restraint is not barred if sought by the United States or an officer or agency of the United States. Leiter Minerals v. United States, 352 U.S. 220 (1957); NLRB v. Nash-Finch Co., 404 U.S. 138 (1971). Restraint is not barred if the state court proceeding is not judicial but rather administrative. Prentis v. Atlantic Coast Line Co., 211 U.S. 210 (1908); Roudebush v. Hartke, 405 U.S. 15 (1972). *Compare* Hill v. Martin, 296 U.S. 393, 403 (1935), *with* Lynch v. Household Finance Corp., 405 U.S. 538, 552–56 (1972).

[1300] The statute is to be applied "to prevent needless friction between state and federal courts." Oklahoma Packing Co. v. Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., 309 U.S. 4, 9 (1940); Atlantic Coast Line R.R. v. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, 398 U.S. 281, 285–86 (1970).

[1301] Article IV, § 1, of the Constitution; 28 U.S.C. § 1738.

[1302] Allen v. McCurry, 449 U.S. 90, 95–96 (1980).