

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 March 19, 2015*
Decided March 20, 2015

Before

DANIEL A. MANION, *Circuit Judge*

ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*

DIANE S. SYKES, *Circuit Judge*

No. 14-3637

RICHARD S. DENIS,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

RIVERWALK HOLDINGS, LTD., and
CIRCUIT COURT OF BROWN
COUNTY, WISCONSIN,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 14-C-1341

William C. Griesbach,
Chief Judge.

ORDER

Richard Denis appeals the dismissal of his civil-rights suit asserting that he was denied due process in a state-court debt-collection proceeding brought against him. We affirm.

* The defendants were not served in the district court and are not participating in this appeal. After examining the appellant's brief and the record, we have concluded that this appeal is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

As set forth in Denis's complaint, a Wisconsin state court violated his due process rights in a debt-collection suit by entering summary judgment against him rather than acceding to his request to have the case be decided by a jury. After the summary judgment was affirmed by a state appellate court, *Riverwalk Holdings, Ltd. v. Denis*, 847 N.W.2d 426 (Wis. Ct. App. 2014), and his petition for review denied by the Wisconsin Supreme Court, *Riverwalk Holdings, Ltd. v. Denis*, 855 N.W.2d 695 (Wis. 2014), Denis brought this suit under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Riverwalk Holdings, the creditor, and the state trial court. At screening, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2), the district court pointed out that federal courts lack jurisdiction to review cases that attack state-court judgments, and it dismissed Denis's complaint under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine. See *D.C. Ct. of App. v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462, 486 (1983); *Rooker v. Fid. Trust Co.*, 263 U.S. 413, 416 (1923).

On appeal Denis asserts that the district court overlooked his due-process claim that he was denied his right to a jury trial. But this injury of which he complains was caused by the state court's grant of summary judgment. The district court correctly concluded that *Rooker-Feldman* blocks federal courts from entertaining suits seeking to redress injuries caused by state-court judgments. See *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 284 (2005); *Harold v. Steel*, 773 F.3d 884, 885 (7th Cir. 2014).

AFFIRMED.