

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 01-1192

THOMAS E. TILLEY; INVESTMENT TRUST,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

TOWN OF ABERDEEN; J. ARTHUR PARKER, individually and in his capacity as Mayor for the Town of Aberdeen; TONY ROBERTSON, individually and in his capacity as Town Manager for the Town of Aberdeen; GILES HOPKINS, individually and in his capacity as Planning Director for the Town of Aberdeen; DON WALKER, individually and in his capacity as Code Enforcement Officer; NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN RESOURCES; COUNTY OF MOORE; STEVE BIGGS, former Town Manager of Aberdeen; BILL MARTS, former Mayor of the Town of Aberdeen; SAMUEL W. FIELDS, individually and in his capacity as an agent of the North Carolina Department of Human Resources; ALL DEFENDANTS,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

THE BROUGH LAW FIRM, in its capacity as attorneys for the Town of Aberdeen; WILLIAM MORGAN, individually and in his capacity as attorney for the Town of Aberdeen,

Defendants.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Durham. N. Carlton Tilley, Jr., Chief District Judge. (CA-98-896-1)

Submitted: May 17, 2001

Decided: May 23, 2001

Before WIDENER, NIEMEYER, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Thomas E. Tilley, Appellant Pro Se; Knox Kent Lively, III, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellants. Timothy Patrick Sullivan, Robin Tatum Morris, Michelle Lee Frazier, POYNER & SPRUILL, Raleigh, North Carolina; Mabel Y. Bullock, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina; Tyrus Vance Dahl, Jr., Andrew Christian Buckner, WOMBLE, CARLYLE, SANDRIDGE & RICE, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Thomas E. Tilley and Investment Trust appeal from the district court's orders dismissing their conspiracy, due process, equal protection, and taking claims as unripe and denying their motion for reconsideration. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinions and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Tilley v. Town of Aberdeen, No. CA-98-896-1 (M.D.N.C. Jan. 16 & Mar. 30, 2001). 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