

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 06-1988

JOSEPH ANGELO GRICCO; BARBARA ANN GRICCO,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

versus

CARVER BOAT CORPORATION, LLC,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. J. Frederick Motz, District Judge. (1:04-cv-01854-JFM)

Submitted: April 25, 2007

Decided: May 25, 2007

Before SHEDD and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

J. Stephen Simms, SIMMS SHOWERS, LLP, Baltimore, Maryland, for Appellants. Jeffrey D. Smith, Kathryn D. Soulier, VARNUM, RIDDERING, SCHMIDT & HOWLETT, LLP, Kalamazoo, Michigan, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Joseph and Barbara Gricco appeal the district court's orders granting summary judgment in favor of Carver Boat Corporation, LLC ("Carver") on claims brought under applicable Maryland law.* Summary judgment is appropriate only if, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the non-moving party, there are no genuine issues of material fact in dispute and the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 255 (1986); Evans v. Technologies Applications & Serv. Co., 80 F.3d 954, 958 (4th Cir. 1996).

After thoroughly reviewing the parties' briefs and the joint appendix, including the transcript of the summary judgment hearing, we find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Gricco v. Carver Boat Corp., LLC, No. 1:04-cv-01854-JFM (D. Md. Dec. 15, 2005 and Aug. 9, 2006). We grant the consent motion to submit the case on briefs

*The Appellants initially alleged four causes of action, and the district court granted their motion to amend the complaint to allege three additional claims. The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment on the first four claims; by memorandum opinion and order, the district court granted the Appellee's motion and denied the Appellants' motion. The parties also filed cross-motions for summary judgment on the final three claims; after a hearing, the district court orally granted the Appellee's motion and denied the Appellants' motion. The district court entered judgment for the Appellee. On appeal, the Appellants challenge the district court's rulings on two of the seven claims: negligent misrepresentation and a violation of the Maryland Consumer Protection Act.

and 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