

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 18, 2016*

Decided March 18, 2016

Before

WILLIAM J. BAUER, *Circuit Judge*

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

No. 15-2796

BRENT JARVIS,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CAROLYN W. COLVIN,
Acting Commissioner of Social Security,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of Indiana,
Indianapolis Division.

No. 1:14-cv-00651-TWP-MJD

Tanya Walton Pratt,
Judge.

ORDER

Brent Jarvis applied for Disability Insurance Benefits and Supplemental Security Income, claiming to be disabled by diabetes, depression, and joint pain. An administrative law judge denied benefits, concluding that these impairments, although severe, do not prevent Jarvis from performing light work. In a thorough order the

* After examining the briefs and record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus the appeal is submitted on the briefs and record. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

district court upheld that decision as supported by substantial evidence. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(g).

On appeal Jarvis does not challenge the district court's conclusions or present a legal argument; instead, he asserts that his health has not improved and that no employer will hire him. Although we construe pro se filings liberally, *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001), we cannot find in Davis's brief any challenge to the district court's decision. The brief contains only a request that we award benefits ourselves but lacks any discussion of the district court's analysis or the ALJ's underlying decision. Even pro se litigants must comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(8), which requires that an appellate brief contain a cogent argument and reasons supporting it, with citations to authority and relevant parts of the record. Although we "are generally disposed toward providing a litigant the benefit of appellate review," *Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545, we will not craft arguments or conduct legal research on behalf of a litigant. Because Jarvis has not presented an argument, we are left with nothing to review.

DISMISSED.