











































16

No. 12-3571

meaningful opportunity to be heard” (even though, as seen in Section I, the Commission had no obligation to do either). *LaChance v. Erickson*, 522 U.S. 262, 266 (1998). As a result, Frey received all the process that the due process clause requires. Frey seems to think that the due process clause entitles the company to a full evidentiary hearing whenever one of its protected property rights is adversely affected, but Frey’s thinking defies clear Supreme Court precedent: “In general, something less than a full evidentiary hearing is sufficient prior to adverse administrative action.” *Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. Loudermill*, 370 U.S. 532, 545 (1985). In sum, even if site approval were a protected property right under the Fourteenth Amendment due process clause, Frey would not have been entitled to any additional process.

### III

Frey was not entitled to any process at all before the revocation of its site approval for the retail sale of alcohol. Yet Frey nonetheless received due process of law before the Peoria Liquor Commission revoked its site approval. Consequently, Frey’s procedural due process claim fails on all accounts. We accordingly AFFIRM the district court’s grant of summary judgment to the City of Peoria.