

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 June 9, 2026*

Decided June 11, 2026

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Chief Judge*

CANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*

REBECCA TAIBLESON, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-2409

HANNIBAL MU BEY,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

FRANK BISIGNANO, Commissioner of
Social Security,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 1:23-cv-02721

Franklin U. Valderrama,
Judge.

ORDER

Hannibal Mu Bey sued the Social Security Administration (SSA) after one of its employees allegedly gave him an application form for social security insurance rather than disability insurance benefits. This lawsuit is the third of four lawsuits Mu Bey has brought against the SSA concerning his efforts to receive disability insurance benefits, all of which were dismissed. In this third lawsuit, he contended that the agency

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

conspired and discriminated against him based on his Moorish-American identity, in violation of 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985, and 1986. He also asserted state-law claims for false arrest, assault, battery, false imprisonment, malicious prosecution, and conspiracy.

The district court granted the SSA's motion to dismiss, concluding that Mu Bey failed to state a claim. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6). According to the court, Mu Bey failed to identify a constitutional right or allege that the SSA was acting under color of state law, as required to state a claim under the federal civil rights statutes he invoked. As to his state-law claims, the court dismissed them on the merits because it was "absolutely clear" that Mu Bey failed to plausibly allege facts to support any of his claims. And because amendment would be futile, the court dismissed the complaint with prejudice.

On appeal, Mu Bey does not engage with the district court's conclusion that his complaint failed to state a claim. We are mindful of Mu Bey's pro se status, but he still must comply with Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and include an argument explaining why the district 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 Mu Bey does not develop an argument contesting the district court's rationale in this case, we dismiss the appeal. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001).

DISMISSED