NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 2, 2022*
Decided December 5, 2022

Before

DAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

CANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*

No. 22-1770

JOSE ISRAEL LEON,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 22-cv-112

William M. Conley,
Judge.

* The defendants-appellees in both cases were not served with process and are not participating in these appeals. We have agreed to decide the appeals without oral argument because they are frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

No. 22-1785

JOSE ISRAEL LEON,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, et al.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 22-C-265

William C. Griesbach,
Judge.

O R D E R

Jose Israel Leon sued several federal and state government agencies in two lawsuits in different judicial districts, in each case alleging a far-reaching conspiracy to torture him. The district courts dismissed his complaints as frivolous at the screening stage. We have consolidated these two appeals for disposition. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 3(b)(2). The two cases have some different defendants and were brought in separate districts, but the complaints are substantially similar, as are the decisions under review and Leon's briefs. Because Leon fails to develop any arguments, we dismiss the appeals.

Leon's lawsuits assert that the government and military "attached" to his brain in 2018 and that the defendants use technologies such as electromagnetic pulses and drones to control his brain and torture him, his family, and others. He also asserted that disease, terrorism, global warming, and other ills are part of this campaign. As relief in both cases, he asked for records related to the alleged misconduct, for criminal immunity, and for the defendants to stop torturing him and his family.

When Leon applied to proceed in forma pauperis, the district courts screened and dismissed the complaints. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). In the Western District, Judge Conley explained that Leon's complaint violated pleading rules and was "frivolous": Leon did not ground his "outlandish" and "far-reaching" allegations in fact and did not identify how he was harmed or any person who was responsible. Judge Conley gave a deadline for amending the complaint, but Leon let it pass and proceeded to appeal. In the Eastern District, Judge Griesbach concluded that Leon's allegations were "delusional" and "irrational," dismissed the complaint as frivolous, and denied leave to amend on the ground that it would be futile. Leon appealed this dismissal as well.

We must dismiss the appeals because Leon fails to provide any basis for overturning the district courts' decisions, as required by Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(8). *See Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001). His two "briefs" are in the form of long emails that repeat the allegations in his complaints. We construe pro se arguments liberally, but we cannot glean any ground for reversal from these filings, which do not mention why the complaints were found lacking or develop any arguments for reversal. *See id.*; *Shipley v. Chicago Bd. of Election Comm'rs*, 947 F.3d 1056, 1062–63 (7th Cir. 2020); *Klein v. O'Brien*, 884 F.3d 754, 757 (7th Cir. 2018).

DISMISSED