

UNPUBLISHED ORDER
Not to be cited per Circuit Rule 53

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted November 2, 2006*
Decided November 9, 2006

Before

Hon. WILLIAM J. BAUER, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

Hon. DIANE P. WOOD, *Circuit Judge*

No. 06-1108

MICHAEL V. HENDRICKS,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

JO ANNE B. BARNHART,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 04-C-1043

Lynn Adelman,
Judge.

O R D E R

Michael Hendricks applied for supplemental security income (“SSI”) under Title XVI of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 1381a, claiming that his depression and behavioral problems prevent him from working. The Social Security Administration denied his application initially and upon reconsideration, and an administrative law judge concluded, after multiple hearings, that Hendricks was not disabled. Hendricks sought judicial review pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), and, in a lengthy and thorough decision, the district court affirmed.

* After an examination of 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).

On appeal Hendricks asserts without elaboration that the ALJ failed to resolve conflicting medical evidence. His cursory brief merely recites a few selective facts from the record and impermissibly does not include an argument section or citations to any legal authority. Consequently, the appeal warrants dismissal under Fed. R. App. P. 28(a)(9)(A). See *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001) (even *pro se* litigants must comply with Rule 28(a)(9)). In any event, the ALJ's resolution of conflicting medical evidence is supported by substantial evidence, see *Schoenfeld v. Apfel*, 237 F.3d 788, 793 (7th Cir. 2001); *Binion v. Chater*, 108 F.3d 780, 782 (7th Cir. 1997), and the ALJ built an accurate and logical bridge between the evidence and the result. See *Blakes v. Barnhart*, 331 F.3d 565, 568-69 (7th Cir. 2003); *Shramek v. Apfel*, 226 F.3d 809, 811 (7th Cir. 2000). In light of Hendricks's violation of Rule 28(a)(9)(A), this appeal is DISMISSED.