

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

MOHAMMED MOOSAVI,

Plaintiff-Appellant.

v.

No. 99-6247

JAMES ZOOK, Director of Zoning
Administration, Zoning Enforcement
Branch,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria.
James C. Cacheris, Senior District Judge.
(CA-98-1780-A)

Submitted: April 30, 1999

Decided: May 25, 1999

Before WIDENER and LUTTIG, Circuit Judges, and
HALL, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

Mohammed Moosavi, Appellant Pro Se. James Patrick Taves,
Melissa Austin Long, COUNTY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE, Fairfax,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Mohammed Moosavi appeals the order of the district court dismissing his complaint for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Moosavi, a resident of Fairfax County, Virginia, seeks to compel James Zook, the Director of Zoning Enforcement for Fairfax County, to address alleged violations of the county zoning ordinance.

Federal trial courts are tribunals of limited jurisdiction dependent upon statutory grants of jurisdiction from the Congress. See In re Bulldog Trucking, Inc., 147 F.3d 347, 352 (4th Cir. 1998). Accordingly, a plaintiff must assert jurisdiction either by raising a question based on the Constitution, laws or treaties of the United States, see 28 U.S.C. § 1331 (1994), or by claiming jurisdiction based on diversity of citizenship, see 28 U.S.C.A. § 1332 (West 1993 & Supp. 1998). See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a)(1) (stating that pleadings shall contain a statement of the grounds of jurisdiction).

Moosavi alleged no basis for jurisdiction, and we can find none that supports his claims. Moosavi does not claim that the parties have diversity of citizenship, and the information in the record tends to refute this possibility. Furthermore, Moosavi raises no claims under federal law or the Constitution.*

Accordingly, we affirm the decision of the district court. 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

*Because Moosavi failed to assert the subject matter jurisdiction of the district court, his case is distinguishable from Pomponio v. Fauquier County Bd. of Supervisors, 21 F.3d 1319 (4th Cir. 1994) (en banc), overruled in part by Quackenbush v. Allstate Ins. Co., 517 U.S. 706 (1996).