United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted February 9, 2011[*]
Decided February 9, 2011

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Chief Judge*

MICHAEL S. KANNE, *Circuit Judge*

ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, *Circuit Judge*

No. 10-1834

MAURICE DAVIS,	Appeal from the United States District
Plaintiff-Appellant,	Court for the Northern District of Illinois,
	Eastern Division.
v.	
	No. 07 C 4735
JEWISH VOCATIONAL SERVICE and	
ILLINOIS STATE POLICE,	Matthew F. Kennelly,
Defendants-Appellees.	*Judge.*

O R D E R

Maurice Davis, who is black and suffers from a traumatic brain injury, sued Jewish Vocational Service and the Illinois State Police for race discrimination after he was removed from his placement as a janitor with the ISP. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a)(1); 42 U.S.C. § 1981. He also asserted a claim against both agencies for casting him in a false light, based on the

---

[*] After examining the briefs and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the briefs and the record. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

ISP's report to JVS that he is a felon, and sued the ISP for defamation and tortious interference with his employment contract. In a thorough order, the district court granted summary judgment on all claims for the defendants.

Proceeding pro se on appeal, Davis has submitted as his brief a medley of loose documents, the body of which amounts to a single paragraph—a purported statement of facts. He baldly asserts in his submission that he was defamed and falsely accused of being a felon, but nowhere does he develop any meaningful legal argument, with appropriate references to the record, as to why the district court erred in granting summary judgment. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(9)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). We will construe a pro se litigant's brief liberally, but we cannot construct arguments where there are none. *Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545-46; *see Fednav Int'l Ltd. v. Cont'l Ins. Co.*, 624 F.3d 834, 842 (7th Cir. 2010).

Accordingly, the appeal is DISMISSED.