

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 13, 2017*

Decided February 15, 2017

BeforeFRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*ANN CLAIRE WILLIAMS, *Circuit Judge*DIANE S. SYKES, *Circuit Judge*

No. 16-3388

DORIS QUEEN LAVENDER,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*UIC COLLEGE OF DENTISTRY, *et al.,*
*Defendants-Appellees.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of Illinois,
Eastern Division.

No. 16 CV 1996

John W. Darrah,
*Judge.***ORDER**

Doris Queen Lavender sued the UIC College of Dentistry and six dentists for violating her civil rights in fantastical ways, among them allegedly placing a miniature bomb in one of her teeth, electrocuting her “execution style,” and wiretapping her. When she applied to proceed in forma pauperis in the district court, the court dismissed

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because it would not significantly aid the court. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(C). The defendants are not participating in this appeal.

No. 16-3388

Page 2

the lawsuit because her allegations were too speculative to state a claim on which relief could be granted. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

On appeal Lavender repeats the same fantastical allegations but does not provide a reasoned basis for disturbing the district court's conclusion that her allegations did not state a claim. She therefore has not complied with Rule 28(a)(8) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, which requires that an appellate brief contain an argument and reasoning to support it, and which even pro se litigants must follow. *See Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 327–28 (1989); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001).

DISMISSED.