

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 10, 2026*

Decided February 13, 2026

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-2100

L.C. CAIN,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MARK ROGERS, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Eastern District of
Wisconsin.

No. 24-cv-1173-pp

Pamela Pepper,
Chief Judge.

ORDER

L.C. Cain settled a workers' compensation claim in 1991 with his former employer, Milwaukee County. In 2022, Cain attempted to reopen the settlement by filing a state administrative appeal, which was dismissed as untimely. Cain then sued the County, the administrative law judge who presided over his state administrative

* Appellee Milwaukee County was not served with process and is not participating in this appeal. We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

appeal, the lawyer who represented Cain in his workers' compensation proceedings, and the insurance company that issued his annuity as part of the settlement, alleging that the defendants violated his civil rights under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court dismissed Cain's claims against the ALJ because she had absolute judicial immunity, the County because the suit was brought beyond the statute of limitations, and the remaining defendants because they were not state actors.

On appeal, Cain does not argue that the district judge's decision was incorrect, nor does he provide any case law or legal argument that would cast doubt on the ruling. But even pro se plaintiffs must comply with Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, which requires that the appellant provide his "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which [he] relies." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); see *Greenbank v. Great Am. Assurance Co.*, 47 F.4th 618, 629 (7th Cir. 2022). Because Cain's appellate filing presents no argument contesting the district judge's reasoning, we dismiss the appeal. See *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001).

DISMISSED