

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 February 8, 2024*
Decided February 9, 2024

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

CANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-1643

STEVEN DAVIS,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

WILL COUNTY and ILLINOIS
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILY SERVICES,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 23 C 907

Franklin U. Valderrama,
Judge.

ORDER

Steven Davis appeals the dismissal of his second amended complaint against Will County and the Illinois Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). The dismissal was based on Davis's failure to state a plausible claim after receiving several

* The appellees were not served with process and are not participating in this appeal. We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

chances to do so. Because he does not contest the district court's reasoning, we dismiss the appeal.

The district court gave Davis three chances to file a legally sufficient complaint. In his initial complaint, Davis sued Will County and DCFS, alleging without elaboration that he had been arrested and faced criminal charges in state court. The court dismissed it, with leave to amend, for failure to state a claim. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Davis amended his complaint to seek damages arising from allegedly unconstitutional state-court convictions and to assert unrelated grievances against DCFS, including a claim that the agency took him away from his mother years earlier when he was a child. The district court again dismissed the complaint. It explained that, because the state convictions appear intact, his quest for damages was blocked by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 489 (1994). And, the court continued, Davis failed to allege sufficient facts to state a claim for damages against a department of the state. The court offered Davis one more chance to amend his complaint. Davis filed his final complaint in which he stated that he was wrongly imprisoned in Will County for driving under the influence, criminal trespassing, and possession of cannabis. He also reasserted his claim that DCFS damaged him by taking him away from his mother when he was a child. Ruling that this complaint "suffer[ed] from the same deficiencies" as before, the district court dismissed the case with prejudice.

On appeal, Davis does not contest the correctness of the district court's conclusion that his suit failed to state a claim, let alone cite any case law or legal argument that would cast doubt on the ruling. He alludes to the district court's dismissal of his case, but he does not criticize the court's rationale. Although we construe pro se briefs generously, an appellate brief must contain a discernible argument challenging the district court's reason for dismissal and support for that argument. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001). An appellate brief like Davis's "that does not even try to engage the reasons the appellant lost has no prospect of success," *Klein v. O'Brien*, 884 F.3d 754, 757 (7th Cir. 2018), and must therefore be dismissed, *Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545–46.

Davis has pending motions before this court that are largely indecipherable but appear to seek the relief he sought in the district court. Those motions are DENIED.

DISMISSED