

United States Court of Appeals

For the Seventh Circuit
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Submitted October 3, 2018

Decided October 17, 2018

Before

William J. Bauer, *Circuit Judge*
Ilana Diamond Rovner, *Circuit Judge*
Michael Y. Scudder, *Circuit Judge*

DANEA M. ADDISON,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

No. 18-2143 v.

STATE OF INDIANA, doing business
as FAMILY & SOCIAL SERVICES
ADMINISTRATION,
Defendant-Appellee.

] Appeal from the United
] States District Court
] for the Southern District
] of Indiana, Indianapolis
] Division.
]
] No. 1:18-cv-01104-TWP-MPB
]
] Tanya Walton Pratt,
] Judge.

ORDER

Danea Michelle Addison blames the State of Indiana for events that happened years ago that destroyed her life. The district court distilled the allegations in Addison's civil rights complaint against the "State of Indiana d/b/a Family and Social Services Administration" to the following:

She alleges that the "State refuses knowledge of who (and exactly when) the plaintiff was placed on the State's felony child abuse listing absent any charges or allegations thereof – 1992-2005." She [further] alleges that she "was denied employment opportunities or freedom to leave to seek a better life for family." She [also] contends that her children were taken away illegally twice. Counties arranged adoption of her children "absent just cause." She [therefore] seeks "just compensation."

The district court determined that Addison's complaint failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, but gave her additional time to replead her case. Addison could not do so to the district judge's satisfaction, and therefore she dismissed Addison's case, reasoning that the state was not a person suable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and also finding that no actions occurred within the applicable two-year statute of limitations.

Addison filed a timely notice of appeal. Her opening brief, however, pays almost no heed to the requirements of Rule 28(a)(8) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The argument section is a mere 145 words long, stressing the state had no right to destroy her life and the lives of her family and the state therefore should have to pay. Addison offers nothing in the way of legal argument and provides no citation to legal authority beyond a vague reference to "1983 statute." She does not refer to the district court's decision – not mentioning the decision even once – and fails to identify how the district court's reasoning was wrong.

At best, Addison offers a hint of a possible argument in the summary of argument section of her brief: "Appellant believes that her constitutional rights supercede the states [sic] immunity. The appellant's rights should be upheld and [the] state held responsible for their actions." Such an undeveloped, unsupported belief is not nearly enough for our consideration. See *Yasinsky v. Holder*, 724 F.3d 983, 989 (7th Cir. 2013) ("[w]e will not entertain baseless and unsupported factual contentions or undeveloped legal arguments").

Although we "are generally disposed toward providing a [pro se] litigant the benefit of appellate review," even a *pro se* litigant like Addison must identify a basis for overturning the district court's decision and support her argument with citations to the record and relevant legal authority. See *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001) (*pro se* litigants must comply with Fed. R. App. P. 28). Addison simply makes no argument as to how the district court erred. This appeal therefore is DISMISSED.