

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 05-6521**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TERRY WILLIAM STEWART,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 05-6780**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TERRY WILLIAM STEWART,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

**No. 06-6111**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

TERRY WILLIAM STEWART,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Lacy H. Thornburg, District Judge. (CR-01-11)

---

Submitted: August 31, 2006

Decided: September 19, 2006

---

Before WILLIAMS, MICHAEL, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Terry William Stewart, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer Ann Youngs; Matthew Theodore Martens, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY; Anne Magee Tompkins, Assistant United States Attorney, Charlotte, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.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

PER CURIAM:

In Appeal No. 05-6521, Terry Stewart seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his motion for reconsideration of the court's prior order dismissing without prejudice his petition for supersedeas and sanctions for abuse of process. In Appeal No. 05-6780, Stewart appeals the district court's order denying his motion for Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 sanctions against the U.S. Attorney and his paralegal. In Appeal No. 06-6111, Stewart appeals the district court's order denying his motion for new trial. We have reviewed the record and the district court's orders and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated by the district court. United States v. Stewart, No. CR-01-11 (W.D.N.C. filed Mar. 16, 2005 & entered Mar. 18, 2005; filed Apr. 13, 2005 & entered Apr. 15, 2005; filed Nov. 5, 2005 & entered Nov. 7, 2005). We further deny Stewart's motion for "Supersedeas In Court of Appeals." 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