

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 January 19, 2023*

Decided January 23, 2023

Before

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN Z. LEE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 22-1851

JILL OTIS,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

VERONICA BULAON and ACC
MANAGEMENT GROUP, INC.,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 21-CV-954-SCD

Stephen C. Dries,
Magistrate Judge.

ORDER

Jill Otis sued her apartment manager and property-management company, asserting that they terminated her tenancy because of her race or disability. The district court entered summary judgment for defendants, finding—based on undisputed evidence—that the management company terminated Otis’s tenancy because she threatened to kill another tenant.

* After examining the record, we have agreed to decide this case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

On appeal, Otis has not developed any challenge to the district court's reasoning or cited any legal authority. We construe pro se filings liberally, but all litigants must comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a)(8), which requires that a brief contain a cogent argument with citations to authority. *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001). In her brief, Otis merely repeats her contention that her apartment manager knew she was disabled. But Otis points to no evidence to raise an inference of discrimination because, as the district court explained, the manager did not terminate Otis's tenancy. Accordingly, Otis's appeal is dismissed.

Defendants have also moved for sanctions against Otis under Rule 38 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. That rule authorizes us to award "single or double costs" if the appeal is frivolous and the appellant has had a "reasonable opportunity to respond." See FED. R. APP. P. 38. Otis never responded to the appellees' motion, and her argument on appeal is frivolous in that it is undeveloped and not responsive to the district court's ruling. See *Jaworksi v. Master Hand Contractors, Inc.*, 882 F.3d 686, 691 (7th Cir. 2018). We now order Otis to pay double the costs that the appellees incurred in this appeal. We add that the failure to pay this sanction may lead to a filing bar under *Support Systems International, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995).

We DISMISS the appeal and GRANT the motion for sanctions.