

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**

To be cited only in accordance with FED. R. APP. P. 32.1

**United States Court of Appeals**

**For the Seventh Circuit**

**Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted January 31, 2024\*

Decided February 2, 2024

*By the Court:*

No. 23-2417

ANTOINETTE C. SELLERS,

*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*v.*

DOCTOR HOWLETT and ST. LOUIS

UNIVERSITY,

*Defendants-Appellees.*

Appeal from the United States District

Court for the Northern District of

Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 23-cv-3749

Sharon Johnson Coleman,

*Judge.*

**ORDER**

Antoinette Sellers believes that a cancerous mass detected in her lung more than thirty years ago was caused by her prior work in a research laboratory at St. Louis University. In 2023, she sued the university and the doctor who ran the research laboratory, alleging that she only recently became aware of the causal connection when she overheard a conversation (details of which are obscure) between two women at a laundromat. At screening, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), the district court dismissed Sellers's suit as untimely. The court noted that Sellers had filed her suit well beyond the two-year statute of limitations for personal injury suits in Illinois, and she could not avail

---

\* The Appellees were not served with process and are not participating in this appeal. We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

herself of the discovery rule because she made no plausible allegations that in 2022 she discovered a connection between her injuries and the defendants.

Sellers has filed an appellate brief that does not engage the district court's reasoning. The brief consists mostly of unexplained attachments, including excerpts of an amicus brief from an unrelated case, as well as portions of the doctor's resume. Although we construe pro se briefs generously, an appellate brief must contain a discernible argument with citations to supporting authority. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001).

We conclude with the matter of sanctions. Sellers has several unrelated appeals pending before our court, and she appears to have filed briefs that are substantially similar to her brief here. We now warn Sellers that further frivolous appeals may result in sanctions against her, including fines that, if unpaid, may result in a bar on filing papers in any court within this circuit. *See Support Systems International, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995).

DISMISSED