

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 20, 2011*
Decided January 25, 2011

Before

RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*

TERENCE T. EVANS, *Circuit Judge*

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

No. 10-2517

SABEEL CAUDLE EL,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

LAKE COUNTY SHERIFFS, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 08 C 6534

Amy J. St. Eve,
Judge.

ORDER

Sabeel Caudle El sued the Lake County sheriffs and other county officials under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging, among other things, that the conditions of his pretrial confinement violated his constitutional rights. After dismissing several claims at the pleading stage, the court granted summary judgment in favor of defendants on the remaining claims.

*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).

Caudle El devotes the bulk of his appellate brief to arguing about exhaustion of administrative remedies, an issue wholly irrelevant to the district court's disposition of the case. He also enumerates a list of "issues on appeal," some of which merely restate the claims he raised in the district court, but fails to develop an argument for any of these contentions or supply them with legal authority. A litigant in this court, however, must supply "an argument consisting of more than a generalized assertion of error, with citations to supporting authority." *Haxhiu v. Mukasey*, 519 F.3d 685, 691 (7th Cir. 2008) (quoting *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001)); *see also* Fed. R. APP. P. 28(a)(9)(A). And although we construe pro se filings liberally, even litigants proceeding without the benefit of counsel must articulate some reason for disturbing the district court's judgment. *See Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545. Caudle El does not challenge the district court's reasoning: in fact, it is impossible to discern any argument at all.

DISMISSED.