

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 2, 2026*
Decided February 2, 2026

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Chief Judge*

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-3204

FODIES MCBRIDE, SR.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY,
et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 24 C 08442

John Robert Blakey,
Judge.

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

ORDER

Fodies McBride appeals the judgment dismissing his civil action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. Because McBride does not present any ground for reversal, we dismiss the appeal.

This case arises out of mortgage foreclosure proceedings brought against McBride in Illinois state court, of which we take judicial notice. *Ewell v. Toney*, 853 F.3d 911, 917 (7th Cir. 2017). CitiMortgage, Inc. sued McBride for failing to make the required monthly mortgage payments on his home in South Chicago Heights, Illinois. The state trial court eventually entered a judgment of foreclosure and sale on McBride's home.

Days later, McBride turned to federal court and sought to stay the foreclosure sale. The court initially denied the motion as barred by the Anti-Injunction Act, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2283, and later dismissed the case for want of prosecution. Soon thereafter, McBride was evicted from his home.

More than a year later, he returned to federal court and filed this case. He alleged that Allstate Insurance Company and two named agents caused him emotional, physical, and financial distress when they denied his medical claims after he was involved in a car accident. He simultaneously filed another complaint, alleging that police officers from the Village of South Chicago Heights entered his home without a warrant, arrested him, boarded up his home, and turned off the water because of unpaid bills.

Judge Tharp screened the complaints together and dismissed them for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. He determined that neither complaint alleged facts that alleged a violation of federal law, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1331, or any basis for diversity jurisdiction. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a). He then gave McBride one month to file a single consolidated complaint asserting a proper basis for subject matter jurisdiction. The deadline came and went, and Judge Blakey, who had been reassigned the case, dismissed the case.

On appeal, McBride asserts that the defendants failed to answer his complaints, that judicial reassignment was improper, and that the court wrongly dismissed his case *sua sponte*, but he does not engage with the court's dispositive determination that subject matter jurisdiction was lacking. Although we are mindful of McBride's pro se

status, he still must comply with Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and explain why the court's decision was incorrect. FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *see Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022). Because McBride does not develop an argument contesting the district court's rationale, we dismiss the appeal. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001).

DISMISSED