

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-2840

FRANK E. HOWARD,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD OF ELECTION LAWS;
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ELECTIONS OF PRINCE
GEORGE'S COUNTY; PARRIS GLENDENING, in his
official capacity as Governor of the State of
Maryland,

Defendants - Appellees.

COMMITTEE FOR THE CAPITAL CITY,

Amicus Curiae.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, Chief District Judge.
(CA-96-2558-JFM)

Submitted: August 28, 1997

Decided: September 9, 1997

Before WILKINS, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Frank Edward Howard, Appellant Pro Se. John Joseph Curran, Jr., Attorney General, Mary O'Malley Lunden, Kathleen Hoke Dachille, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland; Ralph W. Powers, Jr., LOMBARDI, POWERS & AMSTER, Upper Marlboro, Maryland; Erik H. Nyce, DECARO, DORAN, SICILIANO, GALLAGHER, SONNTAG & DEBLASIS, Lanham, Maryland, for Appellees. George Simons LaRoche, Takoma Park, Maryland, for Amicus Curiae.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

Appellant appeals the district court's order dismissing his complaint and denying his motion for reconsideration in this civil action, wherein he sought a declaration that as a resident of the District of Columbia he has a right to participate in the congressional elections in the state of Maryland. We have reviewed the record and the district court's opinion and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. Howard v. State Admin. Bd. of Election Laws, No. CA-96-2558-JFM (D. Md. Nov. 14, 1996). We deny amicus curiae's motion for oral argument and dispense with 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