

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 02-2304

ROBERT WILLIAMS FOX; JANE L. FOX,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

BALTIMORE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PERMITS AND
DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. Andre M. Davis, District Judge. (CA-02-
3074-AMD)

Submitted: December 16, 2002

Decided: December 18, 2002

Before NIEMEYER, MICHAEL, and GREGORY, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert William Fox, Appellant Pro Se. Edward J. Gilliss, County
Attorney, Paul M. Mayhew, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Towson,
Maryland, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Robert and Jane Fox appeal the district court's order granting summary judgment in favor of Baltimore County in their action challenging the constitutionality of Baltimore County's Code enforcement process based on an alleged violation of their due process rights. We affirm.

This Court reviews a district court's order granting summary judgment de novo. Stone v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co., 105 F.3d 188, 191 (4th Cir. 1997). Summary judgment is appropriate when there is no genuine issue of material fact given the parties' burdens of proof at trial. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(c); Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 247-48 (1986).

With these standards in mind, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. We also deny the Foxes' motion for a writ of prohibition. See Gurley v. Superior Court of Mecklenburg County, 411 F.2d 586, 587 (4th Cir. 1969). 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