UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

Think Tank, Inc. v. ITegrity, Inc., et al.

Think Tank · No. MJM-22-1587 · Decided March 31, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maryland addresses Defendants' motion for summary judgment in a dispute involving alleged diversion of government-contracting opportunities, breach of fiduciary duty, trade-secret misappropriation, computer-related misconduct, and related claims. The court grants summary judgment in part and denies it in part, allowing the breach-of-fiduciary-duty claim based on allegedly directing business to ITegrity to proceed while rejecting several other fiduciary-duty theories.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Matthew J. Maddox
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maryland
DECIDED	March 31, 2026
DOCKET	MJM-22-1587
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Defendants moved for summary judgment on all counts of Think Tank's Second Amended Complaint after removal from Maryland state court and completion of discovery.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56, summary judgment is proper when the movant shows that there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. The court views facts and reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmovant but may not weigh evidence or make credibility determinations.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished

TOPICS

summary judgment · government contracts · fiduciary duty · trade secrets · civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

commercial litigation | government contracts | intellectual property | civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether summary judgment was proper on Think Tank's breach-of-fiduciary-duty claims against Bawa.
2. Whether a genuine dispute existed as to whether Bawa breached his duty of loyalty by directing NOAA business to ITegrity while still serving as Think Tank's President.
3. Whether ITegrity could be liable for aiding and abetting Bawa's alleged breach of fiduciary duty.
4. Whether Think Tank established misappropriation of trade secrets under the Maryland Uniform Trade Secrets Act or Defend Trade Secrets Act.
5. Whether Think Tank's conversion claims based on retention of laptops could proceed.
6. Whether Think Tank abandoned or failed to support its breach-of-contract, conspiracy, and Computer Fraud and Abuse Act claims.
7. Whether genuine disputes existed regarding alleged violations of the federal and Maryland Wiretap Acts and Stored Communications Acts.

HOLDINGS

1. Summary judgment was denied because the record supported competing inferences as to whether Bawa, while serving as Think Tank's President, diverted NOAA work to ITegrity in violation of his duty of loyalty and whether Think Tank was harmed.
2. Bawa was entitled to summary judgment on the fiduciary-duty theories based on gifting laptops, losing the NMITS bid, interfering with Redhorse, and accessing Think Tank's email after termination.
3. ITegrity was entitled to summary judgment on the aiding-and-abetting claim because Think Tank presented no evidence that ITegrity knowingly and substantially assisted Bawa's alleged breach.
4. Defendants were entitled to summary judgment on the MUTSA and DTSA claims because Think Tank presented no evidence that the laptop information was misappropriated through improper means or used or disclosed.
5. Bawa and Rossi were entitled to summary judgment on the conversion claims because Think Tank did not show unauthorized dominion over the laptops or an intent inconsistent with Think Tank's rights.
6. Summary judgment was denied on the federal and Maryland Wiretap Act claims against Bawa because the evidence created a genuine dispute as to whether he caused contemporaneous interception of emails through an automatic forwarding rule.
7. Summary judgment was denied on the federal and Maryland Stored Communications Act claims against Bawa because Think Tank's termination letter expressly revoked his authorization to access company accounts.

KEY QUOTATIONS

> *“Viewing the facts supported by the record in the light most favorable to the Think Tank, genuine disputes exist as to whether Bawa breached fiduciary duties by failing to act “solely for the benefit of his employer in*

> *all matters within the scope of employment" and by improperly interfering with Think Tank's business opportunities, and whether Think Tank was harmed as a result."* (Section IV.A.4)

> *"Even assuming, arguendo, that the files on Rossi's and Bawa's computers were trade secrets, Think Tank's claims must fail because there is no evidence to suggest that Defendants misappropriated that information."* (Section IV.C)

> *"Viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to Plaintiff, the Court finds a genuine dispute of material fact as to whether Bawa accessed Think Tank's email system contemporaneously."* (Section IV.G)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Think Tank, a government-contracting company, was founded by Anju Kaur and Harinder Bawa, who owned 51% and 49% of the company, respectively. Bawa served as Think Tank's President and Treasurer until his termination at the end of 2021, while Michelle Rossi resigned in 2019 and began working for competing government contractor ITegrity. Think Tank alleged that Bawa and others diverted NOAA government-contracting opportunities to ITegrity, retained company laptops and information, accessed Think Tank's email system after Bawa's termination, and committed related statutory and tort violations. The record contained evidence that Bawa encouraged NOAA to consider ITegrity for work previously performed by Think Tank and that Bawa accessed Think Tank's email system after termination, but it lacked evidence establishing misappropriation of trade secrets, conversion, aiding and abetting, conspiracy, or breach of contract.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Think Tank filed suit in the Circuit Court for Montgomery County, Maryland, amended its complaint, and Defendants removed the case to the United States District Court for the District of Maryland. Think Tank filed a Second Amended Complaint asserting thirteen claims. After discovery, Defendants moved for summary judgment, which the court granted in part and denied in part.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 322 (1986)
- Cybernet, LLC v. David, 954 F.3d 162, 168 (4th Cir. 2020)
- Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248-49 (1986)
- Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986)
- Plank v. Cherneski, 231 A.3d 436, 442, 466 (Md. 2020)
- Maryland Metals, Inc. v. Metzner, 382 A.2d 564, 568-69, 571-72 (Md. 1978)
- EndoSurg Medical, Inc. v. EndoMaster, Inc., 71 F. Supp. 3d 525, 556 (D. Md. 2014)
- C&R Caulking v. Bank of Am., N.A., 2021 WL 2661875, at *7 (D. Md. June 29, 2021)
- Alleco Inc. v. Harry & Jeanette Weinberg Found., Inc., 665 A.2d 1038, 1050 (Md. 1995)

- Sutton v. FedFirst Fin. Corp., 126 A.3d 765, 792 (Md. App. Ct. 2015)
- ClearOne Advantage, LLC v. Kersen, 710 F. Supp. 3d 425, 435 (D. Md. 2024)
- Brightview Grp., LP v. Teeters, 441 F. Supp. 3d 115, 129 (D. Md. 2020)
- Sys. 4, Inc. v. Landis & Gyr, Inc., 8 F. App’x 196, 200 (4th Cir. 2001)
- Optic Graphics, Inc. v. Agee, 591 A.2d 578 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. 1990)
- Darcars Motors of Silver Spring, Inc. v. Borzym, 841 A.2d 828, 835-36 (Md. 2004)
- Messing v. Bank of Am., N.A., 821 A.2d 22, 35 (Md. 2003)
- United States v. Szymuszkiewicz, 622 F.3d 701, 703-06 (7th Cir. 2010)
- Konop v. Hawaiian Airlines, Inc., 302 F.3d 868, 877-88 (9th Cir. 2002)
- Diebler v. State, 776 A.2d 657, 663 (Md. 2001)
- Skapinetz v. CoesterVMS.com, Inc., 2019 WL 2579120, at *3 (D. Md. June 24, 2019)
- Van Buren v. United States, 593 U.S. 374, 389 (2021)
- Rodgers v. Eagle All., 586 F. Supp. 3d 398, 448-49 (D. Md. 2022)
- Kramer v. Mayor & City Council of Balt., 723 A.2d 529, 542 (Md. 1999)