

5. Conclusion

The Court finds that there is no question of material fact with respect to Maid's claim that Alcatraz tortiously interfered with Maid's business relations. Maid has proven each of the four elements of tortious interference as a matter of law. Consequently, the Court hereby GRANTS Maid's Motion for Summary Judgment with respect to its tortious interference claim. The Court DENIES Alcatraz's Motion for Summary Judgment.

6. Relief

Maid does not seek money damages as a result of Alcatraz's tortious interference and instead seeks only a permanent injunction against future sale of individual vouchers and e-tickets for Maid tours by Alcatraz, as well as an award of attorney's fees and expenses.

Alcatraz argues that Maid has not shown tortious interference with business relations; therefore, Maid is not entitled to injunctive relief.

"The standard for a permanent injunction is essentially the same as for a preliminary injunction except that the plaintiff must show actual success on the merits instead of a likelihood of success." Amoco Prod. Co. v. Village of Gambell, 480 U.S. 531, 546 n. 12 (1987). However, "[i]n addition to succeeding on the merits, a plaintiff must demonstrate the presence of two elements: continuing irreparable injury if the injunction does not issue, and the lack of an adequate remedy at law." Siegel v. LePore, 234 F.3d 1163, 1213 (11th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation and citation omitted).