NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 October 9, 2025*
Decided October 14, 2025

Before

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2410

DYTANIEL L. MCBRIDE, *Plaintiff-Appellant*,	Appeal from the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.
v.	No. 24-cv-1072-MMM
JOHN R. YA'CUP, et al., *Defendants-Appellees*.	Sara Darrow, *Chief Judge*.

ORDER

Dytaniel McBride, who was convicted of drug charges, appeals the dismissal of his civil complaint asserting constitutional claims in connection with his arrest. The district court dismissed McBride's action as barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486–87 (1994). We affirm.

---

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

We accept as true the facts alleged in McBride's complaint and draw all reasonable inferences in his favor. *Courtney v. Butler*, 66 F.4th 1043, 1046 (7th Cir. 2023). McBride is serving a 30-year sentence for money laundering and drug offenses. His convictions stemmed from evidence that he owned and operated a clothing store that served as a front for drug dealing—bank deposits for the store showed receipts of cash deposits that well exceeded the store's modest revenues. *See United States v. McBride*, 724 F.3d 754 (7th Cir. 2013). McBride alleges that his convictions were secured through a broad conspiracy in which a swath of defendants—federal and local law enforcement officials, prosecutors, judges, his defense attorney, and the bank that held his business account—fabricated a bank account in his business's name, forged checks, and made deposits into his real business account. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(2)–(3), 1986; 28 U.S.C. § 1331; *Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971). The district court dismissed McBride's complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, concluding that his claims were barred by *Heck* because a judgment in his favor would necessarily imply the invalidity of his convictions.[†]

On appeal, McBride restates his legal theories without contesting *Heck*'s applicability to this case. But the district court rightly dismissed his suit as *Heck*-barred. Under *Heck*, any civil action, regardless of the relief sought, is barred if it necessarily implies the invalidity of a criminal conviction that has not been satisfied by other means or proceedings. 512 U.S. at 486–87; *Morgan v. Schott*, 914 F.3d 1115, 1120 (7th Cir. 2019); *see Hill v. Murphy*, 785 F.3d 242, 244 (7th Cir. 2015) (applying *Heck* to *Bivens* actions); *Amaker v. Weiner*, 179 F.3d 48, 52 (2d Cir. 1999) (applying *Heck* to §§ 1985 and 1986 claims). McBride's claims—that the defendants conspired to fabricate evidence, fraudulently obtained search warrants, and seized his assets—challenge the validity of his convictions, and he has not shown that his convictions have been invalidated.

We close with the matter of sanctions. In 2021, after we deemed frivolous McBride's repeated attempts to collaterally attack his convictions, we sanctioned him by

---

[†] McBride also sought immediate release from custody. But the district court lacked jurisdiction to consider this request. McBride, who initiated his first 28 U.S.C. § 2255 proceeding in 2015 and has since filed eight unsuccessful petitions for a certificate of appealability, may not use a civil-rights suit to obtain relief from ongoing custody and evade the limitations on successive motions under § 2255. *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 500 (1973); *United States v. Evans*, 224 F.3d 670, 674-75 (7th Cir. 2000).

fining him $500 and barring him from making further collateral attacks on his convictions. *McBride v. United States*, No. 21-1630 (Order of Aug. 26, 2021); *see Alexander v. United States*, 121 F.3d 312 (7th Cir. 1997). Moreover, in this appeal, in our order denying leave to proceed in forma pauperis, we warned McBride that further attempts to challenge his criminal convictions or pursue frivolous litigation may result in additional sanctions, including a broader filing bar. *McBride v. Ya'Cup*, No. 24-2410 (Order of Jan. 21, 2025). He nonetheless proceeded with this appeal, repeating the same challenge to his convictions that resulted in the *Alexander* bar. Because this appeal frivolously attempts to attack his convictions, we sanction McBride with a $1,000 fine.

Unless and until McBride pays all outstanding filing fees and sanctions, the clerks of all federal courts in this circuit are directed to return unfiled any papers submitted either directly or indirectly by him or on his behalf. *See In re City of Chicago*, 500 F.3d 582, 585–86 (7th Cir. 2007); *Support Sys. Int'l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995). This order will be lifted immediately once McBride makes full payment. *See In re City of Chicago*, 500 F.3d at 585–86. If McBride, despite his best efforts, is unable to pay in full all outstanding sanctions and fees, no earlier than two years from the date of this order, he may submit to this court a motion to modify or rescind this order that explains in detail what efforts he has made to pay the amounts he owes. *See id.*; *Mack*, 45 F.3d at 186.

AFFIRMED