

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 February 24, 2025*

Decided February 24, 2025

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2858

BRIAN K. SMITH,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,
Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 24 C 75

Matthew F. Kennelly,
Judge.

ORDER

Brian Smith appeals the dismissal of his employment-discrimination suit against his employer, Ford Motor Company. The district court dismissed the suit based on

* The appellee was not served with process and is 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).

Smith's failure to state a plausible claim for relief. Because he does not contest the district court's reasoning, we dismiss the appeal.

On a court-provided form, Smith marked boxes claiming that Ford discriminated against him based on his race and disability. He attached over 60 pages of documents but did not explain how they related to his claim. The district court, unable to discern the nature of Smith's allegations, dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim but granted him leave to amend. Smith responded with a flurry of filings, including one that the court construed as an amended complaint. The court observed that Smith had "not come anywhere close to complying" with its earlier directive, advised him what he needed to do to cure the deficiencies, and gave him a second chance to amend.

In the next version of his complaint, Smith explained that he was suing Ford under the Illinois Whistleblower Act. 740 ILCS 174/1. The court again dismissed the complaint, stating that Smith failed to allege how his rights were violated, by whom, or when. The court noted that some documents in his earlier filings were untimely because they concerned incidents from nearly 10 years ago, and regardless, Smith failed to explain how the documents pointed to any wrongdoing. The court gave Smith a third opportunity to amend, but he submitted only a letter that he said showed "evidence of harassment." The court then recruited counsel to make sense of Smith's claims. After counsel reported back that Smith lacked any plausible federal claim, the district court dismissed the case with prejudice.

On appeal, Smith does not contest the correctness of the district court's decision, nor does he provide any case law or legal argument that would cast doubt on the ruling. Although we construe pro se briefs liberally, an appellate brief must contain a discernible argument challenging the district court's reason for dismissal and support for that argument. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). Because an appeal is meant to evaluate the district court's decision, *see Wonsey v. City of Chi.*, 940 F.3d 394, 398 (7th Cir. 2019), it must be dismissed if the appellant's brief lacks any basis to disturb the judgment, *see Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545.

DISMISSED