



---

2002 Decisions

Opinions of the United  
States Court of Appeals  
for the Third Circuit

---

11-6-2002

## Christman v. Sandt

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2002](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Christman v. Sandt" (2002). *2002 Decisions*. 702.

[https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit\\_2002/702](https://digitalcommons.law.villanova.edu/thirdcircuit_2002/702)

This decision is brought to you for free and open access by the Opinions of the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit at Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in 2002 Decisions by an authorized administrator of Villanova University Charles Widger School of Law Digital Repository.

NOT PRECEDENTIAL

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

---

No. 02-1761

---

NORMAN CHRISTMAN and DIANE CHRISTMAN,  
husband and wife,  
Appellants

v.

ROBERT SANDT; CITY OF ALLENTOWN

---

APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA  
(D.C. Civ. No. 01-cv-04522 )  
District Judge: Honorable Robert F. Kelly

---

Submitted Under Third Circuit L.A.R. 34.1(a)  
November 1, 2002

Before: NYGAARD and WEIS, Circuit Judges, and IRENAS,\* District Judge.

(Opinion filed November 4, 2002)

---

OPINION

---

---

\* The Honorable Joseph E. Irenas, United States District Judge for the  
District of New Jersey, sitting by designation.

WEIS, Circuit Judge.

In this case, the District Court granted summary judgment for the defendants concluding that they properly conducted an administrative search of plaintiffs' home.

Because the parties are familiar with the details of this case and the judgment will be non-precedential, it is not necessary to review the factual background at length.

The defendant, City of Allentown, enacted an ordinance providing for a systematic inspection of residential units to insure that they comply with applicable local ordinances, state laws and regulations. When plaintiffs refused defendants entry into their rental unit, the city inspector secured a warrant and entered the house in the presence of uniformed police. Once inside, the inspection revealed a number of items that required repair.

The plaintiffs contend that the search warrant was deficient on its face, and that their Fourth Amendment rights were violated. We have reviewed the submissions of the parties and agree with the District Court's conclusions that the ordinance is reasonable, that the warrant was properly issued, and that the defendants' constitutional rights were not violated. See Camara v. Municipal Court of the City and County San Francisco, 387 U.S. 523 (1967).

Accordingly, the judgment of the District Court will be affirmed.

By the Court,

/s/ Joseph F. Weis, Jr.  
Circuit Judge

