

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 July 17, 2025*

Decided July 17, 2025

Before

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN Z. LEE, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-1169

DONALD R. BIANCHI,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of
Social Security,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 24 CV 3970

Jeremy C. Daniel,
Judge.

ORDER

Donald Bianchi, a claimant seeking Social Security disability benefits, appeals the dismissal of his lawsuit for failure to comply with court directives. We affirm.

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the briefs and record adequately present the facts and legal arguments, and oral argument would not significantly aid the court. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

Bianchi applied, unsuccessfully, for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income. When the Appeals Council denied review in August 2021, it informed Bianchi that he had 60 days to file a civil action in district court. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 405(g). He received a 30-day extension in December 2021 but did not file a complaint with the district court until May 2024. The Commissioner of Social Security then moved to dismiss the complaint on untimeliness grounds. The district court agreed with the Commissioner and dismissed the complaint. But the court permitted Bianchi to amend his complaint to add allegations that might warrant equitable tolling. Bianchi failed, however, to file an amended complaint within the specified deadline, so the court dismissed the suit with prejudice.

On appeal, Bianchi raises two arguments, both unavailing. He first asserts that the district court erred in dismissing his complaint because he complied with the court's instructions and "met all deadlines." Yet he did not heed the court's direction to amend his complaint and explain how he was prevented from filing a civil action in the preceding two years. A district court has inherent power to manage its docket, and with that power comes the discretionary authority to dismiss a case for failure to obey reasonable orders. *Dorsey v. Varga*, 55 F.4th 1094, 1104 (7th Cir. 2022). We are mindful of Bianchi's status as a pro se litigant, but he is still required to follow the court's orders. *See DJM Logistics, Inc. v. FedEx Ground Package Sys., Inc.*, 39 F.4th 408, 415 (7th Cir. 2022).

Bianchi also asserts that he suffers from several mental illnesses and should be given another opportunity to file an amended complaint. But he waived this argument by not raising it in the district court. *Johnson v. Prentice*, 29 F.4th 895, 903 (7th Cir. 2022).

AFFIRMED