

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-2397

RICHARD BANNERMAN; TRICIA BANNERMAN; JESSE BRYAN; PAMELA
BRYAN; SHAWN FOSTER; MELISSA FOSTER; WILLIAM GARDNER;
SHELLIE GARDNER,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

v.

MOUNTAIN STATE PAWN, INCORPORATED, d/b/a Famous
Pawnbrokers/Jewelry & Loan, a West Virginia corporation,

Defendant - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern
District of West Virginia, at Martinsburg. John Preston Bailey,
Chief District Judge. (3:10-cv-00046-JPB)

Submitted: June 10, 2011

Decided: June 27, 2011

Before MOTZ, GREGORY, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Paul G. Taylor, LAW OFFICES OF PAUL G. TAYLOR, PLLC,
Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellants. Michael D.
Lorensen, Jared M. Adams, BOWLES, RICE, MCDAVID, GRAFF & LOVE
PLLC, Martinsburg, West Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Appellants Richard and Tricia Bannerman, Jesse and Pamela Bryan, Shawn and Melissa Foster, and William and Shellie Gardner, husbands and wives, sued Mountain State Pawn, Inc., d/b/a Famous Pawnbrokers/Jewelry & Loan ("Mountain State"), for injuries the men sustained during a shooting that occurred at the Quality Inn and Conference Center in Jefferson County, West Virginia. The shooter, a convicted felon, had purchased the pistol at issue from Mountain State, and Appellants alleged that the illegal sale of a firearm to a convicted felon proximately caused their injuries.

As noted by the district court, Appellants' action was barred by the statute of limitations. Moreover, neither the Gun Control Act, under 18 U.S.C. § 922(d)(1) (2006), nor the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act ("PLCAA"), 15 U.S.C. §§ 7901 (2006) et. seq., provided Appellants with a civil cause of action. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons as stated by the district court in its thorough opinion on the matter. Bannerman v. Mountain State Pawn, Inc., No. 3:10-cv-00046-JPB (N.D.W. Va. Nov. 5, 2010). 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