

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 April 15, 2024*

Decided April 16, 2024

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-1135

ANTONIA M. GONZALEZ-NUNEZ,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CHRISTOPHER M. VERSER, JR.,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 24-C-0057

Lynn Adelman,
Judge.

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

No. 24-1140

ANTONIA M. GONZALEZ-NUNEZ,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY CIRCUIT
COURT
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 24-C-0029

Lynn Adelman,
Judge.

ORDER

On the same day in January 2024, Antonia Gonzalez-Nunez filed two civil-rights lawsuits in federal court arising out of interactions that she and her children had with Wisconsin courts. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. First, she sued the Milwaukee County Circuit Court for discriminating against her son when it docketed a case in his name rather than hers. (No. 24-C-0029). Second, she sued her child’s father for misconduct in custody proceedings (e.g., disobeying child-custody and financial-support orders) that deprived her of her constitutional rights. (No. 24-C-0057). The district court dismissed both complaints at screening, concluding that Gonzalez-Nunez could not sue on behalf of her son without an attorney, was not deprived of any federally protected right, and could not sue the father under § 1983 because he was not acting under color of state law.

Gonzalez-Nunez filed separate appeals with this court. Because they stem from a similar factual background, we now consolidate both appeals for disposition. Her appellate briefs, however, do not comply with Rule 28(a)(8) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. They do not engage with the district court’s reasons for its decisions, advance no cogent arguments, and cite no law other than references to statutes that do not bear on these proceedings. Although we construe pro se briefs generously, an appellate brief must contain a discernible argument with citations to supporting authority. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28; *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001).

We conclude with the matter of sanctions. Gonzalez-Nunez has several unrelated appeals pending before our court. We now warn her that further frivolous appeals may

result in sanctions, including fines that, if unpaid, may result in a bar on filing papers in any court within this circuit. *See Support Sys. Int'l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995).

DISMISSED