

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FIFTH DISTRICT

JANUARY TERM 2012

JOHN S. WHITE AND ANNA I. WHITE,

Appellants,

v.

Case No. 5D10-1835

LORILLARD TOBACCO COMPANY,

Appellee.

_____ /

Opinion filed March 9, 2012

Appeal from the Circuit Court
for Volusia County,
William A. Parsons, Judge.

Steven L. Brannock, Celene H. Humphries, and
Tyler K. Pitchford, of Brannock & Humphries, and
Hendrik Uiterwyk and Brent R. Bigger, of
Abrahamson & Uiterwyk, Tampa, for Appellants,
John S. White and Anna I. White.

David L. Ross, Elliot H. Scherker, Brigid F. Cech
Samole, of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Miami,
for Appellee, Lorillard Tobacco Company.

David B. Thorne and Jennifer M. Voss, of Shook,
Hardy & Bacon, L.L.P., Tampa, and William P.
Geraghty and Frank Cruz-Alvarez, of Shook, Hardy
& Bacon, L.L.P., Miami, and Jeffrey E. Bigman, of
Smith, Hood, Loucks, Stout, Bigman & Brock, P.A.,
Daytona Beach, for Appellee, Philip Morris USA,
Inc.

Kelly Anne Luther, Maria H. Ruiz and Giselle
Gonzalez Manseur, of Kasowitz, Benson, Torres &
Friedman, LLP, Miami, for Appellees, Liggett Group
LLC and Vector Group Ltd.

PER CURIAM.

Appellants challenge the summary judgment in favor of Lorillard Tobacco Company, Philip Morris USA, Inc., R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Company, Vector Group, Ltd., Inc., and Liggett Group, LLC (collectively "Appellees") in this *Engle*¹-progeny case. Appellants argue that: (1) summary judgment was premature; (2) summary judgment was improper because Appellees did not prove the absence of fact issues; and (3) summary judgment was improper as to the civil conspiracy count. We affirm the trial court's summary judgment on all counts, except the civil conspiracy count. As to that count, we adopt the well-reasoned opinion of our sister court in *Rey v. Philip Morris, Inc.*, 75 So. 3d 378 (Fla. 3d DCA 2011).²

AFFIRMED IN PART; REVERSED IN PART AND REMANDED.

GRIFFIN, TORPY and LAWSON, JJ., concur.

¹ *Engle v. Liggett Grp., Inc.*, 945 So. 2d 1246 (Fla. 2006).

² At oral argument, counsel alerted this Court that Vector Group, Ltd., had not been a defendant in *Engle* and might have other defenses not yet addressed below. For clarity, our decision today only addresses issues that were properly before us.