

**United States Court of Appeals  
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT**

\_\_\_\_\_  
No. 99-3236MN  
\_\_\_\_\_

In re: Larry Kenneth Alexander, \*

Debtor, \*

-----  
Larry Kenneth Alexander, \*

Appellant, \*

v. \*

Chrysler Financial Corporation, \*

Creditor - Appellee, \*

Jasmine Z. Keller, Chapter 13 Trustee, \*

Trustee - Appellee. \*

\* On Appeal from the United  
\* States District Court  
\* for the District of  
\* Minnesota.

\* [Not To Be Published]

\_\_\_\_\_  
Submitted: November 3, 2000

Filed: November 17, 2000  
\_\_\_\_\_

Before RICHARD S. ARNOLD, HANSEN, and BYE, Circuit Judges.  
\_\_\_\_\_

PER CURIAM.

Larry Kenneth Alexander appeals the District Court's<sup>1</sup> affirmance of Bankruptcy Court<sup>2</sup> orders denying a claimed homestead exemption; denying confirmation of his Chapter 13 plan and converting the proceeding to one under Chapter 7; overruling his objection to a proof of claim by Chrysler First Financial Services n/k/a Chrysler Financial Corporation, L.L.C. (Chrysler); and dismissing his adversary proceeding against Chrysler. While this appeal was pending, Chrysler moved pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 7 for an order requiring Alexander to post a bond, which the District Court granted. Also pending are Alexander's motions to proceed in forma pauperis (IFP), and to consolidate this appeal with another appeal he has pending before this Court, Larry Kenneth Alexander v. Mary Jo A. Jensen-Carter, No. 99-4285.

Alexander has not posted the appellate bond, and argues in his IFP application that the District Court did not have jurisdiction to impose the bond because he had filed his appellate brief with this Court.

This Court has discretion to deal with a violation of the rules of appellate procedure in any way we see fit, including dismissing the appeal. See Fed. R. App. P. 3(a). Alexander has not cited any authority supporting his position that the District Court was without jurisdiction to order him to post the bond, and given the complete lack of merit to his appeal, we grant Chrysler's motion to dismiss this appeal, and we deny Alexander's pending motions as moot. Cf. Skolnick v. Harlow, 820 F.2d 13, 15 (1st Cir. 1987) (per curiam) (affirming District Court's imposition of Rule 7 order and stating that, if appellant fails to comply by certain date, companion merits appeal "shall be dismissed").

---

<sup>1</sup>The Honorable John R. Tunheim, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

<sup>2</sup>The Honorable Dennis D. O'Brien, Chief Judge, United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Minnesota.

A true copy.

Attest:

CLERK, U.S. COURT OF APPEALS, EIGHTH CIRCUIT.