

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 September 2, 2025*

Decided September 3, 2025

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-3023

BRYON K. CHAMP,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

SHIRLEY FORCUM, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of Illinois.

No. 3:19-CV-345-MAB

Mark A. Beatty,
Magistrate Judge.

ORDER

Bryon Champ, formerly confined at a mental health facility, challenges the summary judgment order rejecting his claim that the facility's staff retaliated against him for filing lawsuits and grievances. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. We affirm.

This suit arises out of Champ's involuntary confinement as a pretrial detainee at Chester Medical Health Center in 2018. He asserted that Chester's staff intentionally lost

* 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).

his legal materials and personal possessions in retaliation for (1) prior lawsuits he had filed against officials at the Winnebago County Jail and (2) administrative grievances he had filed against the facility's staff. A magistrate judge, presiding with the parties' consent, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 636(c), recruited counsel to represent Champ and later entered summary judgment for the defendants. As the judge explained, Champ did not present any evidence that some defendants were personally involved in the loss of his possessions, and no jury could find that the remaining defendant—therapist Carri Morris—had acted with retaliatory intent. The undisputed evidence, the judge said, showed that Morris followed Chester's standard procedures when she filled out the authorization form to have Champ's personal property sent to his next location.

Champ, now proceeding pro se, rehashes the arguments that he made in his summary-judgment response and does not develop any challenge to the district court's ruling. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). We have reviewed the record and affirm for substantially the same reasons stated by the district court.

AFFIRMED