

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA**

No. 9-917 / 09-0274  
Filed February 10, 2010

**DEVANI DEARMOND,**  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

**vs.**

**CRAIG GRIFFIEON and  
LARRY J. HANDLEY,**  
Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County, Arthur E. Gamble,  
Judge.

Devani DeArmond appeals from the grant of summary judgment in her suit  
against Craig Griffieon and Larry Handley based on allegations of fraud, breach  
of fiduciary duty, and tortious interference. **AFFIRMED.**

Warren Bush, Wall Lake, for appellant.

Mark McCormick of Belin McCormick, P.C, Des Moines, for appellee  
Griffieon.

Jeffrey Boehlert of Patterson Law Firm, L.L.P., Des Moines, for appellee  
Handley.

Considered by Sackett, C.J., Vaitheswaran and Danilson, JJ.

**PER CURIAM.**

Devani DeArmond appeals from the grant of summary judgment in her suit against Craig Griffieon and Larry Handley based on allegations of fraud, breach of fiduciary duty, and tortious interference. We affirm.

We review the district court's summary judgment rulings for the correction of errors at law. Iowa R. App. P. 6.907 (2009); *Faeth v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 707 N.W.2d 328, 331 (Iowa 2005). Summary judgment is appropriate when the pleadings, depositions, answers to interrogatories, admissions on file, and affidavits show there is no genuine issue of material fact, and the moving party is entitled to a judgment as a matter of law. Iowa R. Civ. P. 1.981(3); *Walderbach v. Archdiocese of Dubuque, Inc.*, 730 N.W.2d 198, 199 (Iowa 2007). We review the record in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. *Green v. Racing Ass'n of Cent. Iowa*, 713 N.W.2d 234, 238 (Iowa 2006).

DeArmond's claims are based on the defendants' actions in handling her grandparents' estates. She filed a motion to reopen her grandmother's estate challenging the some of the same actions that she challenges here. The Associate Probate Judge denied her request and we affirmed in an unpublished opinion. *In re the Estate of Griffieon*, No. 08-1898 (Iowa Ct. App. Aug. 6, 2009).

The district court, in sustaining the defendants' motions, in essence found the claims DeArmond makes here have been satisfied, settled, or were barred either because they had been litigated or were barred by claim preclusion

because they could have been litigated in the prior action. The district court did not err in sustaining defendants' motions for summary judgment.

**AFFIRMED.**