

United States Court of Appeals

**For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604**

Submitted April 26, 2005*
Decided April 27, 2005

Before

Hon. JOHN L. COFFEY, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. TERENCE T. EVANS, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. DIANE S. SYKES, *Circuit Judge*

No. 04-4024

LOREN LONGARD,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CITY OF GREEN BAY, et. al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Eastern District of
Wisconsin

No. 03-C-544

William E. Callahan, Jr.,
Magistrate Judge.

ORDER

Loren Longard sued the City of Green Bay, Wisconsin, claiming that his due process rights were violated when his public vehicle licenses were revoked for deliberately attempting to circumvent the city's insurance requirements for taxis. The district court granted summary judgment for the city, finding that Longard failed to exhaust administrative remedies, that the post-deprivation procedures he was afforded "satisfied due process," and that no other constitutional rights were violated.

* After an examination of the briefs and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the briefs and the record. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Appealing pro se, Longard fails to set forth any argument challenging the basis of the district court's decision. Instead he filed a letter relating his hardship, and inserted handwritten comments between the lines and in the margins of a copy of the district court's decision, asserting blanket denials of wrongdoing and charging that his rights had been violated. Although we construe pro se filings liberally, the appellant must point to some specific error in law or fact on the part of the district court. *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). Because Longard failed to comply with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9), he has forfeited appellate review of the district court's decision. *Voelker v. Porsche Cars of North America, Inc.*, 353 F.3d 516, 528 (7th Cir. 2003). This appeal is DISMISSED.