

United States Court of Appeals

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

Submitted June 2, 2005*
Decided June 2, 2005

Before

Hon. WILLIAM J. BAUER, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. TERENCE T. EVANS, *Circuit Judge*

Nos. 04-1648 & 04-2688

DOUGLAS MIDDLETON,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

KIMBERLY RUSSELL et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 02-C-0882

Charles N. Clevert, Jr.,
Judge.

ORDER

Wisconsin inmate Douglas Middleton suffers from phlebitis, a chronic disease resulting in painful inflammation of leg or arm veins. Unhappy with the treatment he received at Racine Correctional Institution, he filed this lawsuit against several medical practitioners and prison officials, alleging deliberate indifference to a serious medical need in violation of the Eighth Amendment. Middleton claimed, among other things, that RCI had changed his medications in order to cut costs and bought him the wrong kind of support stockings. The district court granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment, holding that RCI had not disregarded Middleton's medical needs, but had in fact taken "exceptional steps" to address

* 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).

them. Accordingly, Middleton could not establish the mental state necessary to prove deliberate indifference.

On appeal Middleton does not present any specific legal challenge to the district court's conclusions, but merely asserts that he did not receive appropriate medical treatment and that the district court mishandled his case. Middleton's vague and unfocused presentation lacks citations to the record and accordingly does not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9), which requires even pro se litigants to submit a brief containing cognizable arguments with supporting citations. *See Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). Accordingly, we must dismiss his appeal.

DISMISSED.