

general election. Kurita pursued an unsuccessful write-in candidacy. Barnes won the election and is currently serving in that seat.

Meanwhile, Kurita also sued the State Primary Board of the Tennessee Democratic Party, among others, in federal court, seeking to have her name placed on the general election ballot. She asserted that the Tennessee statute allowing political party officials to rule on challenges to primary election results, Tenn. Code Ann. § 2-17-104, violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment because the statute has no procedural rules and it does not allow for judicial review; that Democratic Party officials violated her rights because rules for the review of the primary results were not adopted until the morning of the hearing; and that party officials did not adequately explain their reasons for overturning the primary results. The district court dismissed her complaint, finding that Kurita could not “establish two prerequisites that are necessary in order to sustain the . . . due process claims . . . : (A) state action by the State Primary Board of the Tennessee Democratic Party and (B) her possession of a protected property right in the certified results of votes cast in the primary election.” *Kurita v. State Primary Bd. of Tenn. Democratic Party*, No. 3:08-0948, 2008 WL 4601574, at *5, 2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8871 (M.D. Tenn. Oct. 14, 2008).

After carefully reviewing the record, the settled law, the well-reasoned briefs, and the oral arguments on appeal, we conclude that the district court’s order and opinion correctly sets out the applicable law under § 1983 and correctly applies that law to the facts in the record. Because we see no reason to either add to or elaborate on the district court’s opinion, the issuance of a full written opinion by this court would serve no useful purpose. Accordingly, for the reasons stated in the

No. 08-6245, *Kurita v. State Primary Board of the Tennessee Democratic Party, et al.*

district court's opinion, we **AFFIRM** the judgment of the district court. We deny as moot the appellees' joint motion to dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.