UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 96-2395

In Re: ANDREW CLIFFORD MOORE,

Debtor.

GEORGE E. MCDERMOTT,

Creditor - Appellant,

versus

ANDREW CLIFFORD MOORE,

Debtor - Appellee,

versus

OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE,

Party in Interest.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Marvin J. Garbis, District Judge. (CA-95-3904-MJG, BK-88-42746)

Submitted: April 14, 1998 Decided: May 5, 1998

Before ERVIN, HAMILTON, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

George E. McDermott, Appellant Pro Se. Janet Marsha Nesse, RILEY & ARTABANE, Washington, D.C., for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

George McDermott appeals from the district court's order affirming the bankruptcy court's order denying his motion to compel performance under Andrew Moore's bankruptcy plan of reorganization. We have reviewed the bankruptcy court record, the district court record, and the district court's opinion affirming the decision of the bankruptcy court and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we deny McDermott's motion for a motions hearing and affirm on the reasoning of the district court. McDermott v. Moore, Nos. CA-95-3904-MJG, BK-88-42746 (D. Md. Sept. 5, 1996). The following people filed nearly identical motions entitled "Partner's Motion in Support of Appellant George E. McDermott's Pro Se Motion for Return of Partnership Assets to Rightful Owners and Motion for Appointment of a Trustee/Receiver": Louis W. Johnson, Jr., Harold and Rosanna McDermott, Tamara Sheaff, Steven J. Evan, David and Ruth Kay, Billie Jo and Elaine Walker, and Jon Johnson. Because these people are not parties to this appeal and have not moved for leave to intervene, and because McDermott has not filed a motion for return of partnership assets in this court, we deny these motions. McDermott filed in this court an objection to the debtor's attorney's motion to withdraw from further proceedings. The motion was filed in, and granted by, the bankruptcy court. McDermott's objection is not properly before the court, and, in any event, it is meritless. We deny, as moot, McDermott's motion to expedite the appeal. 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.

AFFIRMED