

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 21, 2025*

Decided October 24, 2025

Before

CANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*

JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

NANCY L. MALDONADO, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-3102

ANTHONY ROLAND,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

NBC SUBSIDIARY (WMAQ-TV) LLC,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 24-CV-4500

Jeremy C. Daniel,
Judge.

ORDER

Anthony Roland filed a complaint against NBC Subsidiary (WMAQ-TV) LLC for conducting “unauthorized zoom” calls through his television, then broadcasting recordings of him, commenting on his appearance, and imitating his hand gestures back

* 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).

at him. The district court dismissed the suit as frivolous, reflecting paranoid and delusional fears.

On appeal, Roland asserts that the court disregarded certain evidence that he attached to his amended complaint—(1) a digital recording of him waving and gesturing at the television while watching the Today Show and (2) affidavits from several witnesses attesting that they saw a “Zoom experience” violate Roland’s right to privacy. But these materials add nothing to his implausible allegations that WMAQ-TV committed the Illinois tort of “intrusion on seclusion,” *W. Bend Mut. Ins. Co. v. Krishna Schaumburg Tan, Inc.*, 183 N.E.3d 47, 58 (Ill. 2021), or violated 19 U.S.C. § 1592, the civil penalty provision under the Tariff Act of 1930 for fraud, gross negligence, or negligence in importing merchandise. And to the extent Roland believes that the district court deprived him of due process by dismissing the case without a hearing, no evidentiary hearing is required when the factual allegations—as here—are incredible. *Gladney v. Pendleton Corr. Facility*, 302 F.3d 773, 774 (7th Cir. 2002). The district court rightly dismissed this case as frivolous. *See, e.g., Lee v. Clinton*, 209 F.3d 1025 (7th Cir. 2000).

We close with a word about sanctions. Since 2018, Roland has filed five frivolous cases in the Northern District of Illinois asserting unauthorized surveillance via television. He has appealed four of them, and all were dismissed. We now warn Roland that further repetitive and frivolous filings may result in sanctions, including fines that, if unpaid, may result in a bar on filing papers in civil lawsuits in any court within this circuit. *See Support Sys. Int’l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995).

AFFIRMED