

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 January 27, 2025*
Decided February 4, 2025

Before

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

NANCY L. MALDONADO, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2710

CEDRIC GREENE,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 24 C 8611

Robert W. Gettleman,
Judge.

ORDER

Cedric Greene has sued the United States, alleging that unspecified restrictions are prohibiting him from obtaining reinstatement of his Section 8 benefits. (Section 8 of the Housing Act of 1937, 42 U.S.C. § 1437f, helps state housing authorities subsidize rent

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

for eligible low-income households.) Because Greene moved to proceed in forma pauperis, the district court screened the complaint and dismissed it for failure to state a claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. 1915(e)(2)(b)(ii).

On appeal, Greene argues that the district court erred by not allowing him to amend his complaint, but district courts may deny leave to amend when amendment would be futile. *Runnion ex rel. Runnion v. Girl Scouts of Greater Chi. & Nw. Ind.*, 786 F.3d 510, 519–20 (7th Cir. 2015). That is the case here. Greene has sued the United States, asserting that other potential defendants have passed away. But the United States enjoys sovereign immunity unless Congress has waived it. *Dolan v. U.S. Postal Service*, 546 U.S. 481, 484 (2006). Greene identifies no waiver that might apply in a proposed amended claim. Because sovereign immunity is a “threshold grounds for denying audience to a case on the merits,” *Meyers v. Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisc.*, 836 F.3d 818, 823 (7th Cir. 2016), dismissal without leave to amend was appropriate.

This court notes that Greene’s brief on appeal is nonresponsive to the district court’s order and raises frivolous arguments irrelevant to his original grievance. Further, we are aware that Greene has filed similar frivolous suits in other jurisdictions, and courts have sanctioned him, sometimes with filing restrictions, for litigating frivolously or vexatiously. To the extent that his reference in this suit to a “restriction” may reflect his bad faith effort to avoid filing bars elsewhere, we warn Greene that any further frivolous appeals here may result in sanctions against him, including fines that, if unpaid, may result in a bar on filing papers in any court within this circuit. *See Support Systems International, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995).

AFFIRMED