IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

FIFTH DISTRICT JANUARY TERM 2004

LOCKHEED MARTIN,

Appellant,

v. CASE NO. 5D03-489

ANTHONY J. GERACE,
FRANK CASEY, et al.,

Appellee.
_____/

Opinion filed April 16, 2004

Appeal from the Circuit Court
for Orange County,
George A. Sprinkel, IV, Judge.

Sylvia H. Walbolt, Matthew J. Conigliaro and
Rachel A. Ramsey, of Carlton Fields, P.A.,
St. Petersburg, and Leslie Joughin, III,
Wesley D. Tibbals and James W. Seegers,
of Akerman Senterfitt, Tampa, for Appellant.

Mark A. Ash and Zebulon D. Anderson, of Smith,
Anderson, Blount, Dorsett, Mitchell & Jernigan, LLP,
Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Darryl M. Bloodworth and Nichole M. Mooney,
of Dean, Mead, Egerton, Bloodworth, Capouano
& Bozarth, P.A., Orlando, for Appellees, Anthony
J. Gerace and Tompkins Associates, Inc.

Hal K. Litchford and Scott K. Lippman, of Litchford
& Christopher, Orlando, for Appellees, Tompkins
Associates, Inc.

PER CURIAM.

This summary judgment case is somewhat unusual because of its size. There are ninety-four volumes of record and dozens of depositions and affidavits. In all this, however, we agree with the conclusion of the trial court that there is simply no evidence to support a legally sufficient claim of tortious interference with an advantageous business relationship, breach of fiduciary duty, civil conspiracy or unjust enrichment against any defendant. And the evidence of any breach of Mr. Gerace's duty of loyalty to Lockheed Martin, such as his involvement in the September 30, 2000, meeting is, at best, *de minimis*. Entry of summary final judgment was proper.

AFFIRMED.

SAWAYA, C.J., GRIFFIN and MONACO, JJ., concur.