

## NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 September 22, 2016\*

Decided September 22, 2016

## Before

MICHAEL S. KANNE, *Circuit Judge*ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, *Circuit Judge*DIANE S. SYKES, *Circuit Judge*

No. 16-1822

TERRANCE HOLLOWELL,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*CHASE HOME FINANCE, et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*Appeal from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of Indiana,  
South Bend Division.

No. 3:16cv134

Philip P. Simon,  
*Chief Judge.*

## ORDER

Terrance Hollowell appeals the district court's dismissal of his untimely appeal from a bankruptcy court's order. We affirm.

Hollowell, a debtor in a Chapter 13 case, brought an adversary complaint in bankruptcy court against Chase Home Finance and JPMorgan Chase, alleging that they

---

\* We have unanimously agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the briefs and record adequately present the facts and legal arguments, and oral argument would not significantly aid the court. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

No. 16-1822

Page 2

had committed fraud during his bankruptcy proceedings. The bankruptcy court dismissed Hollowell's complaint for failure to state a claim and on February 18, 2016, denied his motion to amend the complaint.

Twenty days later, on March 9, 2016, Hollowell filed a notice of appeal with the district court. The district court concluded that he failed to file his notice of appeal within the 14-day period required by Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 8002(a)(1), and dismissed the appeal for lack of jurisdiction.

On appeal Hollowell does not meaningfully challenge the district court's dismissal and instead repeats his claims that the defendants committed fraud and violated his rights to equal protection and due process. Even pro se litigants must comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(8), which requires that an appellate brief contain a cogent argument and reasons supporting it. *See Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001). In any event, the district court properly dismissed the appeal because it was filed outside of the 14-day period required by Rule 8002(a)(1). *See* 28 U.S.C. § 158(c)(2); *In re Sobczak-Slomczewski*, 826 F.3d 429, 432 (7th Cir. 2016).

AFFIRMED.