UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-1604

JAY CLOGG REALTY GROUP, INC.; STANLEY ADOFF; AGV SPORTS GROUP, INC.; MICHAEL PARROTTE; STEVEN G. BERRY; BREY CORP.; DEBRA COLBERT; GERMANTOWN COPY CENTER, INC.; GOLD LEINS & ADOFF; PEGGY HARRIS; HOLDEN ROGERS; KATHLYNNE RAMIREZ ESQUIRE LLC; ANDREW RENGARTS; STEPHEN A. SHECHTEL; JAMES J. TEMPLE JR. PA,

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

and

JAY CLOGG; ELMECO ENGINEERING, INC.; TIBOR SARKADY; MICHAEL BREY; JOHNNY R. GARZA; KENSINGTON PHYSICAL THERAPY, INC.; STANLEY SHAPIRO; JAMES J. TEMPLE, JR.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY; METLIFE GROUP, INC.,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland at Greenbelt. Deborah K. Chasanow, Senior District Judge. (8:15-cv-00493-DKC)

Submitted: December 15, 2016 Decided: February 3, 2017

Before DIAZ, FLOYD, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Dockets.Justia.com

Appeal: 16-1604 Doc: 30 Filed: 02/03/2017 Pg: 2 of 3

Stephen H. Ring, STEPHEN H. RING, P.C., Rockville, Maryland, for Appellants. Robert R. Niccolini, OGLETREE, DEAKINS, NASH, SMOAK & STEWART, P.C., Washington, D.C.; Daniel T. Stabile, SHUTTS & BOWEN LLP, Miami, Florida, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Appeal: 16-1604 Doc: 30 Filed: 02/03/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiffs appeal the district court's order denying their Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(d) request, and granting summary judgment in favor of Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and MetLife Group, Inc., on Plaintiffs' claims, brought pursuant to the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, 47 U.S.C.A. § 227 (West 2014 & Supp. 2016), and the Maryland Telephone Consumer Protection Act, Md. Code Ann., Com. Law §§ 14-3201 to 14-3202 (West 2013). We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. See Jay Clogg Realty Grp., Inc. v. Metro. Life Ins. Co., No. 8:15-cv-00493-DKC (D. Md. Mar. 8, 2016; May 2, 2016). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED