

# United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit  
Chicago, Illinois 60604  
Submitted December 17, 2021\*  
Decided December 23, 2021

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

DANIEL A. MANION, *Circuit Judge*

AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 21-1520

LOIS YANKAH,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*v.*

DUPAGE COUNTY, ILLINOIS, and DUPAGE COUNTY  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

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

No. 19-cv-1936  
Jorge L. Alonso, *Judge.*

## Order

The last time this case was here, we held that the district court did not abuse its discretion in rejecting a post-judgment motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 60(b). We added

---

\* This successive appeal has been submitted to the original panel under Operating Procedure 6(b). We have unanimously agreed to decide the case without argument because the briefs and record adequately present the facts and legal arguments, and argument would not significantly aid the court. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2)(C).

that the only open issue concerned the propriety of that decision, and that we could not consider the merits of Yankah's claim because she had not filed a timely appeal. *Yankah v. DuPage County*, No. 20-1618 (7th Cir. Dec. 8, 2020) (nonprecedential disposition).

Yankah then filed another Rule 60(b) motion in the district court. Instead of attempting to establish any of the criteria that justifies relief under that Rule, Yankah simply reargued the merits of her position. The district court summarily rejected the motion, and Yankah appealed.

Just as in her last appeal, Yankah has ignored the procedural posture of the case and argued as if she were entitled to plenary review of the district court's initial decision. That is not so, for reasons explained in our first order. Repeating a set of arguments that we have rejected—and, to an extent, do not even pertain to her case (as our prior order mentioned)—does not assist her position.

The district judge warned Yankah that continuing refusal to accept the adverse outcome of this suit would lead to sanctions. She must take that warning seriously, because an ongoing course of frivolous motions could lead to an order that directs Yankah to pay a substantial monetary penalty and closes the courthouse doors until she complies. See *Support Systems International, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185 (7th Cir. 1995).