

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 December 21, 2022*

Decided December 22, 2022

Before

ILANA DIAMOND ROVNER, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 21-2741

SAMEIDRA CARTER,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

ILLINOIS GAMING BOARD, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 18 C 7039

Gary Feinerman,
Judge.

ORDER

After Sameidra Carter was fired from her job as an investigator with the Illinois Gaming Board, she sued the Board and various employees for violations of the First Amendment; Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3; and the Illinois State Officials and Employees Ethics Act, 5 ILCS 430/15-10. The district court dismissed the First Amendment claim for failure to state a claim, FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6),

* After examining the record, we have agreed to decide this case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

and the Ethics Act claim (with regard to three defendants who she did not allege to have taken any retaliatory action against her) for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3). The court later granted summary judgment to the defendants on Carter's remaining claims under Title VII (on grounds of untimeliness) and the Ethics Act (as preempted by the Illinois Human Rights Act, 775 ILCS 5/8-111(D)).

On appeal Carter generally challenges the court's ruling but does not address its reasoning or provide any meaningful basis for disturbing the judgment. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A) (brief must contain the appellant's "contentions and reasons for them, with citation to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies"). Although we are mindful that Carter is representing herself on appeal, it is not our role to craft parties' arguments for them, and even self-represented parties must comply with Rule 28(a). *See Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022); *Shipley v. Chi. Bd. of Election Comm'rs*, 947 F.3d 1056, 1062–63 (7th Cir. 2020).

DISMISSED