

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 05-1434

---

In Re: SCAT, INCORPORATED,

Debtor.

- - - - -

GARY IVAN TERRY,

Party in Interest - Appellant,

versus

SARAH F. SPARROW,

Trustee - Appellee.

---

No. 05-1435

---

In Re: SCAT, INCORPORATED,

Debtor.

- - - - -

GARY IVAN TERRY,

Party in Interest - Appellant,

versus

SARAH F. SPARROW,

Trustee - Appellee.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Middle District of North Carolina, at Greensboro. James A. Beaty, Jr., District Judge. (CA-04-432-1; CA-04-742-1; BK-01-11367)

---

Submitted: March 30, 2006

Decided: April 5, 2006

---

Before TRAXLER, GREGORY, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Gary Ivan Terry, Appellant Pro Se. Sarah Flintom Sparrow, Cynthia Munk Swindlehurst, TUGGLE, DUGGINS & MESCHAN, PA, Greensboro, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Gary Ivan Terry seeks to appeal from the district court's orders dismissing his appeals from the bankruptcy court's orders approving the settlement of a claim of SCAT Inc.'s bankruptcy estate, and denying his motion to vacate the conversion of SCAT, Inc.'s bankruptcy case from Chapter 11 to Chapter 7. The bankruptcy court denied the motions and the district court dismissed the appeals because they were not filed by a licensed attorney. We have reviewed the records in these appeals and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and dismiss the appeals for the reasons stated by the district court. See Terry v. Sparrow, Nos. CA-04-432-1; CA-04-742-1; BK-01-11367 (M.D.N.C. filed Mar. 30, 2005; entered Mar. 31, 2005 & Apr. 22, 2005). Additionally, we deny Terry's motions for a rehearing of the denial of his motion to disqualify counsel for the Appellee, for sanctions, for appointment of counsel, for review under the Administrative Procedures Act of Appellee's informal brief, and to expedite oral argument. 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.

DISMISSED