

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

COLT'S PLASTICS COMPANY,
INCORPORATED,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

VENTECH, INCORPORATED,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 00-2045

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore.
J. Frederick Motz, Chief District Judge.
(CA-99-3727-JFM)

Submitted: March 30, 2001

Decided: April 24, 2001

Before LUTTIG and GREGORY, Circuit Judges, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Michael D. Faidin, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellant. Gina M. Harasti, JIRANEK & HARASTI, L.L.C., Baltimore, Maryland; George J. Kelly, Jr., SIEGEL, O'CONNOR, SCHIFF & ZANGARI, P.C., New Haven, Connecticut, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

VenTech, Inc. (VenTech) appeals the district court's order granting summary judgment to Colt's Plastics Co., Inc. (Colt's Plastics) in this action seeking to impose liability for a judgment against Venture Media Limited Partnership (Venture Media) on VenTech, Venture Media's general partner. We affirm.

Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 5(a),(b), the motion for summary judgment was properly served by mail. VenTech, as Venture Media's general partner, was liable for the judgment in question, even though VenTech was not a party to the contract with Colt's Plastics that Venture Media breached. Md. Code Ann., Corps & Assn's § 9-307 (1999); *Bennett Heating & Air Conditioning, Inc. v. NationsBank of Md.*, 654 A.2d 949, 959 (Md. Ct. Spec. App. 1995), *rev'd on other grounds*, 674 A.2d 534 (Md. 1996). Finally, Venture Media affirmatively concealed that VenTech was its general partner. Therefore, the limitations period as to VenTech did not begin to run until 1999, when Colt's Plastics, while investigating Venture Media's assets, discovered VenTech and its relationship to Venture Media. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. *See Colt's Plastics Co. v. VenTech, Inc.*, No. CA-99-3727-JFM (D. Md. Jul. 28, 2000). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED