

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**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 May 10, 2024\*

Decided May 10, 2024

**Before**

FRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*

AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN Z. LEE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-2803

DUSAN DRAGISICH,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

*v.*

WEST ALLIS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL,  
et al.,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

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

No. 23-cv-731-pp

Pamela Pepper,  
*Chief Judge.*

**ORDER**

Dusan Dragisich, a Wisconsin prisoner, sued several correctional and medical facilities for subjecting him to improper medical treatment and excessive force. A magistrate judge screened Dragisich's complaint and dismissed it for failure to state a

---

\* The appellees were not served with process and are not participating in this appeal. We have 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).

claim, noting that (1) none of the named defendants was a suable “person” under 42 U.S.C. § 1983; (2) the 20-page complaint violated the “short and plain statement” requirement under Rule 8(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; and (3) Dragisich impermissibly brought unrelated claims against unrelated parties, in violation of Rules 18 and 20 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Dragisich amended his complaint but did not cure the identified defects, so the district judge dismissed his suit for failure to state a claim.

Dragisich appealed, but his appellate brief does not engage the district court’s rationale for dismissing his case, apart from stating that his prior submissions were marred by mental-health issues. He says that he has been receiving psychotropic medication for bipolar, anxiety, post-traumatic stress, and mood disorders. Now that he has “come off [his] anti-psychotics,” he says his mind is clear and he would like another chance to amend his complaint.

The limited scope of this appeal, however, precludes us from reviewing anything other than the district court’s dismissal of Dragisich’s amended complaint. After a district court enters final judgment, a plaintiff may amend a complaint only if he has successfully altered or amended the judgment or if the judgment has otherwise been vacated. *Spiegel v. McClintic*, 916 F.3d 611, 619 (7th Cir. 2019). Dragisich’s problem is that he chose to appeal the district court’s judgment rather than move for leave to amend. *See Webber v. Armslist LLC*, 70 F.4th 945, 968 (7th Cir. 2023). Although we sympathize with Dragisich’s circumstances, we see no basis to disturb the district court’s judgment.

AFFIRMED