

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 September 18, 2023*
Decided September 18, 2023

Before

DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-1300

DeJUAN ANTHONY MASON,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

WALWORTH COUNTY CHILD
SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT AGENCY,
et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 22-CV-1303-JPS

J.P. Stadtmueller,
Judge.

ORDER

After DeJuan Anthony Mason failed to pay child support, a Wisconsin state court held him in contempt and a state enforcement agency collected his debt. Mason sued the agency and others in federal court, alleging that the state court's order and the enforcement actions related to his unpaid child support violated his constitutional

* Appellees were not served with process and are not participating in this appeal. After examining the appellant's brief and the record, we have concluded that the case is appropriate for summary disposition. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2).

rights. The district court dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction under the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, which bars federal district courts from hearing cases brought by state-court losers who complain of injuries caused by state-court judgments. *Exxon Mobil Corp. v. Saudi Basic Indus. Corp.*, 544 U.S. 280, 283–84 (2005) (citing *Rooker v. Fid. Tr. Co.*, 263 U.S. 413 (1923); *D.C. Ct. of Appeals v. Feldman*, 460 U.S. 462 (1983)).¹

On appeal, Mason does not meaningfully develop an argument in his brief, *see* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8), but we understand him generally to challenge the district court’s jurisdictional ruling. As he asserted in his amended complaint, he seeks to have the district court “[v]oid all associated orders and judgments” by the state court regarding his unpaid child support. But asking a federal district court to redress a wrong in a state court’s judgment is squarely what *Rooker-Feldman* prohibits. *See Exxon Mobil Corp.*, 544 U.S. at 284; *Mains v. Citibank, N.A.*, 852 F.3d 669, 676 (7th Cir. 2017).

AFFIRMED

¹ The district court analyzed whether Mason’s injuries were “inextricably intertwined” with state court determinations, but we have discouraged using that phrase because of its potential to blur the boundary between nonjurisdictional matters of preclusion and the *Rooker-Feldman* doctrine, which is jurisdictional. *See, e.g., Milchtein v. Chisholm*, 880 F.3d 895, 898 (7th Cir. 2018); *Iqbal v. Patel*, 780 F.3d 728, 730 (7th Cir. 2015); *Richardson v. Koch Law Firm, P.C.*, 768 F.3d 732, 734 (7th Cir. 2014).