

Supreme Court, U.S.

FILED

MAY 28 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

No. 25m2

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Chad B. Williams - PETITIONER

VS.

Multi-Color Corporation Inc. - RESPONDENT(S)

MOTION TO DIRECT THE CLERK TO FILE OUT OF TIME

I apologize to this Court for the inconvenience in missing my deadline. There was a misunderstanding of the law that occurred. I thought my deadline was May 19, 2025 instead of April 27, 2025. Also, I have continued my case without counsel and I am completely drained and exhausted. Mentally, spiritually, financially, legally, emotionally, family, and psychologically, I am completely drained and exhausted and it will be very difficult to proceed without counsel. I think this Court should grant my motion because my TITLE VII rights were violated. There were 2 positions available and I did not receive any of them. Also, my case meets the requirements in Rule 10. Thank you for your time and patience in this matter.

Sincerely,

Chad B. Williams

RECEIVED

JUN - 9 2025

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Chad B. Williams — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.
Multi-Color Corporation, INC. — RESPONDENT(S)

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS*

The petitioner asks leave to file the attached petition for a writ of certiorari without prepayment of costs and to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

Please check the appropriate boxes:

Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in the following court(s):

United States Court of Appeals For the Seventh Circuit

United States District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin

Petitioner has **not** previously been granted leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* in any other court.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration in support of this motion is attached hereto.

Petitioner's affidavit or declaration is **not** attached because the court below appointed counsel in the current proceeding, and:

The appointment was made under the following provision of law: _____
_____, or

a copy of the order of appointment is appended.

Chad B. Williams
(Signature)

**AFFIDAVIT OR DECLARATION
IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED *IN FORMA PAUPERIS***

I, Chad B. Williams, am the petitioner in the above-entitled case. In support of my motion to proceed *in forma pauperis*, I state that because of my poverty I am unable to pay the costs of this case or to give security therefor; and I believe I am entitled to redress.

1. For both you and your spouse estimate the average amount of money received from each of the following sources during the past 12 months. Adjust any amount that was received weekly, biweekly, quarterly, semiannually, or annually to show the monthly rate. Use gross amounts, that is, amounts before any deductions for taxes or otherwise.

| Income source | Average monthly amount during the past 12 months | | Amount expected next month | |
|--|---|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| | You | Spouse | You | Spouse |
| Employment | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>2,000</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Self-employment | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Income from real property (such as rental income) | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Interest and dividends | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Gifts | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Alimony | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Child Support | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Retirement (such as social security, pensions, annuities, insurance) | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Disability (such as social security, insurance payments) | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Unemployment payments | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Public-assistance (such as welfare) | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Other (specify): _____ | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |
| Total monthly income: | \$ <u>0</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> | \$ <u>2,000</u> | \$ <u>N/A</u> |

2. List your employment history for the past two years, most recent first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

| Employer | Address | Dates of Employment | Gross monthly pay |
|--------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Seek Careers | 2311 W Washington | 03/10/2025 | \$ 2,000 |
| Staffing | St. West Bend, Wi. 53095 | to present | \$ 0 |
| | | | \$ 0 |

3. List your spouse's employment history for the past two years, most recent employer first. (Gross monthly pay is before taxes or other deductions.)

| Employer | Address | Dates of Employment | Gross monthly pay |
|----------|---------|---------------------|-------------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A | \$ 0 |
| | | | \$ 0 |
| | | | \$ 0 |

4. How much cash do you and your spouse have? \$ 0

Below, state any money you or your spouse have in bank accounts or in any other financial institution.

| Type of account (e.g., checking or savings) | Amount you have | Amount your spouse has |
|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| Checking | \$ 500.00 | \$ 0 |
| Savings | \$ 100.00 | \$ 0 |
| | \$ | \$ |

5. List the assets, and their values, which you own or your spouse owns. Do not list clothing and ordinary household furnishings.

Home
Value N/A

Other real estate
Value N/A

Motor Vehicle #1
Year, make & model N/A
Value 0

Motor Vehicle #2
Year, make & model N/A
Value 0

Other assets
Description N/A
Value 0

6. State every person, business, or organization owing you or your spouse money, and the amount owed.

| Person owing you or your spouse money | Amount owed to you | Amount owed to your spouse |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| N/A | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| N/A | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| N/A | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |

7. State the persons who rely on you or your spouse for support. For minor children, list initials instead of names (e.g. "J.S." instead of "John Smith").

| Name | Relationship | Age |
|-------------|---------------------|------------|
| N/A | N/A | N/A |
| | | |
| | | |

8. Estimate the average monthly expenses of you and your family. Show separately the amounts paid by your spouse. Adjust any payments that are made weekly, biweekly, quarterly, or annually to show the monthly rate.

| | You | Your spouse |
|---|------------|--------------------|
| Rent or home-mortgage payment (include lot rented for mobile home) | \$ 1,000 | \$ 0 |
| Are real estate taxes included? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | | |
| Is property insurance included? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No | | |
| Utilities (electricity, heating fuel, water, sewer, and telephone) | \$ 300.00 | \$ 0 |
| Home maintenance (repairs and upkeep) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Food | \$ 300.00 | \$ 0 |
| Clothing | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Laundry and dry-cleaning | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Medical and dental expenses | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |

| | You | Your spouse |
|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| Transportation (not including motor vehicle payments) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Recreation, entertainment, newspapers, magazines, etc. | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Insurance (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments) | | |
| Homeowner's or renter's | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Life | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Health | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Motor Vehicle | \$ 500.00 | \$ 0 |
| Other: <u>N/A</u> | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Taxes (not deducted from wages or included in mortgage payments) | | |
| (specify): <u>N/A</u> | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Installment payments | | |
| Motor Vehicle | \$ 500.00 | \$ 0 |
| Credit card(s) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Department store(s) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Other: <u>N/A</u> | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Alimony, maintenance, and support paid to others | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Regular expenses for operation of business, profession, or farm (attach detailed statement) | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Other (specify): <u>N/A</u> | \$ 0 | \$ 0 |
| Total monthly expenses: | \$ 2600.00 | \$ 0 |

9. Do you expect any major changes to your monthly income or expenses or in your assets or liabilities during the next 12 months?

Yes No If yes, describe on an attached sheet.

10. Have you paid – or will you be paying – an attorney any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form? Yes No

If yes, how much? \$10,000.00

If yes, state the attorney's name, address, and telephone number:

Maxwell Livingston 933 N Mayfair Rd STE 300 Milwaukee, Wi. 53226 (414)6 (414)666-8499

Alan C. Olson 2880 S Moorland Rd New Berlin, Wi. 53151 (262)785-9606

11. Have you paid—or will you be paying—anyone other than an attorney (such as a paralegal or a typist) any money for services in connection with this case, including the completion of this form?

Yes No

If yes, how much? N/A

If yes, state the person's name, address, and telephone number: N/A

12. Provide any other information that will help explain why you cannot pay the costs of this case.

N/A

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on: May 15, 2025

Chad B. Williams
(Signature)

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

Chad B. Williams — PETITIONER
(Your Name)

VS.
Multi-Color Corporation, INC.
— RESPONDENT(S)

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO

United States Court of Appeals For the Seventh Circuit
(NAME OF COURT THAT LAST RULED ON MERITS OF YOUR CASE)

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Chad B. Williams

(Your Name)

2920 N 26th St.

(Address)

Milwaukee, Wi. 53206

(City, State, Zip Code)

(414) 215-1126

(Phone Number)

QUESTION(S) PRESENTED

- 1. Were my Title VII rights violated?**

- 2. Does my case meet the requirements stated in Rule 10?**

LIST OF PARTIES

All parties appear in the caption of the case on the cover page.

All parties **do not** appear in the caption of the case on the cover page. A list of all parties to the proceeding in the court whose judgment is the subject of this petition is as follows:

RELATED CASES

Williams v. Fort Dearborn Co., No. 19-C-0847, U. S. District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin. Judgment entered July 19, 2023.

Williams v. Multi-Color Corp. Inc., No. 23-2457, U. S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Judgment entered January 24, 2024.

Williams v. Multi-Color Corp. Inc., No. 23-C-1643, U. S. District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin. Judgment entered July 8, 2024.

Williams v. Multi-Color Corp. Inc., No. 24-2263, U. S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit. Judgment entered January 27, 2025.

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES CITED

| CASES | PAGE NUMBER |
|--|-------------|
| Williams v. Multi-Color Corp. Inc., No. 23-C-1643. | 20 |
| Williams v. Fort Dearborn Co., No. 19-C-0847. | 22 |

STATUTES AND RULES

Rule 10(a) a United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another United States court of appeals on the same important matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power;

(b) a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals;

(c) a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.

OTHER

Title VII of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination base on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. It applies to employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, and training programs, covering all aspects of employment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|---|
| OPINIONS BELOW | 1 |
| JURISDICTION..... | 2 |
| CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED | 3 |
| STATEMENT OF THE CASE | 4 |
| REASONS FOR GRANTING THE WRIT | 5 |
| CONCLUSION..... | 6 |

INDEX TO APPENDICES

APPENDIX A Decision of U. S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

APPENDIX B Decision of U. S. District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin

APPENDIX C Decision of U. S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit

APPENDIX D Complaint

APPENDIX E Decision of U. S. District Court Eastern District of Wisconsin

APPENDIX F Complaint

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

Petitioner respectfully prays that a writ of certiorari issue to review the judgment below.

OPINIONS BELOW

[X] For cases from federal courts:

The opinion of the United States court of appeals appears at Appendix A to the petition and is

[] reported at _____; or,
[x] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the United States district court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

[] For cases from state courts:

The opinion of the highest state court to review the merits appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

The opinion of the _____ court appears at Appendix _____ to the petition and is

[] reported at _____; or,
[] has been designated for publication but is not yet reported; or,
[] is unpublished.

JURISDICTION

For cases from **federal courts**:

The date on which the United States Court of Appeals decided my case was January 27, 2025.

No petition for rehearing was timely filed in my case.

A timely petition for rehearing was denied by the United States Court of Appeals on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1254(1).

For cases from **state courts**:

The date on which the highest state court decided my case was _____. A copy of that decision appears at Appendix _____.

A timely petition for rehearing was thereafter denied on the following date: _____, and a copy of the order denying rehearing appears at Appendix _____.

An extension of time to file the petition for a writ of certiorari was granted to and including _____ (date) on _____ (date) in Application No. A .

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U. S. C. § 1257(a).

CONSTITUTIONAL AND STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Rule 10(a) a United States court of appeals has entered a decision in conflict with the decision of another United States court of appeals on the same important matter; has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with a decision by a state court of last resort; or has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's supervisory power;

(b) a state court of last resort has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with the decision of another state court of last resort or of a United States court of appeals;

(c) a state court or a United States court of appeals has decided an important question of federal law that has not been, but should be, settled by this Court, or has decided an important federal question in a way that conflicts with relevant decisions of this Court.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex, and national origin. It applies to employers, employment agencies, labor organizations, and training programs, covering all aspects of employment.

Key aspects of Title VII:

Protected Characteristics: Title VII prohibits discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex (including pregnancy, sexual orientation, and gender identity), and national origin.

Scope of Protection: The law applies to all aspects of employment, including hiring, firing, promotion, compensation, training, and other terms and conditions of employment.

Employers Covered: Title VII applies to employers with 15 or more employees, as well as state and local governments, employment agencies, and labor organizations.

Enforcement: The EEOC is responsible for enforcing Title VII, investigating complaints, and taking legal action when necessary.

Prohibited Practices: Title VII prohibits a wide range of discriminatory practices, including harassment, retaliation, and the denial of reasonable accommodations for religious observances.

Retaliation: Title VII also prohibits employers from retaliating against employees who file complaints or participate in EEOC proceedings.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

I, Chad B. Williams, began my employment with the defendant in August of 2008. In May of 2018, I did not receive a promotion I truly deserved and filed for racial discrimination in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In fact, there were 2 positions available and I did not receive one of them. After years of egregious acts of retaliation, which included several supervisors, I was wrongfully terminated in October of 2022. The lower courts and the Court of Appeals do not agree with me and has dismissed my cases.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION

This Court should grant certiorari because my Title VII rights were violated and my case meets the requirements in Rule 10. The lower courts were erroneous in their decision because racial discrimination occurred and was overlooked. Also, the decision by the Court of Appeals is in direct conflict with other appellate courts.

CONCLUSION

The petition for a writ of certiorari should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,
Chad B. Williams

Date: May 15, 2025

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 60604Submitted January 27, 2025*
Decided January 27, 2025

Before

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*NANCY L. MALDONADO, *Circuit Judge*

No. 24-2263

CHAD B. WILLIAMS,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Eastern District of
Wisconsin.*v.*MULTI-COLOR CORPORATION, INC.,
Defendant-Appellee.

No. 23-C-1643

Lynn Adelman,
Judge.

CERTIFIED COPY



* 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).

ORDER

Chad Williams sued his former employer, Multi-Color Corporation, alleging that the company fired him after he quarreled with a supervisor over a work request, as it had previously fired similarly insubordinate workers. The district court dismissed Williams's amended complaint. Because the court correctly concluded that Williams failed to state a claim under the anti-retaliation provision of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, *see* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-3(a), we affirm.

This is Williams's second Title VII case against Multi-Color. In his first suit, Williams alleged that in 2019 Multi-Color refused to promote him from the position of "cutting operator" because of his race. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2(a). The district court granted Multi-Color's motion for summary judgment because Williams did not present evidence of discrimination, and we dismissed his appeal for failing to comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a).

Williams filed his second suit—the subject of this appeal—against Multi-Color in 2023 for "egregious acts of retaliation" that he says followed his first suit. The only specific allegations in his amended complaint, which we take as true, *see Williamson v. Curran*, 714 F.3d 432, 437 (7th Cir. 2013), are that, in October 2022, Williams heatedly quarreled with his supervisor about whether his job required him to maintain a machine that he operated. The supervisor repeatedly asked Williams whether he knew how to change the tape of the machine's blade, and Williams replied several times that he did not and that it was "maintenance's job." Incensed by the recurrent questioning, Williams persisted in "argu[ing] loudly" with his supervisor. Multi-Color investigated Williams's workplace conduct and fired him for it later that month, as it had fired other workers when they clashed with the same supervisor.

Williams filed an administrative charge of discrimination (accusing Multi-Color of firing him for "insubordination"), and then this suit challenging the discharge, but the district court dismissed the suit. First, the court reasoned that Williams did not adequately allege that Multi-Color fired him for unlawful discriminatory or retaliatory reasons. *See Swanson v. Citibank, N.A.*, 614 F.3d 400, 404–05 (7th Cir. 2010). Second, the court added, Williams did not exhaust his administrative remedies on a retaliation claim because, as reflected in his administrative charge, Williams charged Multi-Color only with discrimination, not retaliation. *See Swearnigen-El v. Cook Cnty. Sheriff's Dep't*, 602 F.3d 852, 864–65 (7th Cir. 2010). Finally, the district court declined to give Williams

No. 24-2263

Page 3

an opportunity to amend his complaint a second time, citing futility. *See Zimmerman v. Bornick*, 25 F.4th 491, 494 (7th Cir. 2022).

On appeal, Williams asks us to reinstate this case, but Multi-Color first argues that Williams's appeal should be dismissed for failure to comply with Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(a), which requires that an appellant provide "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *see Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). True, Williams's brief is only six sentences long and does not engage with the district court's reasoning. But we prefer to decide cases on the merits and can do so here. *See Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022).

We review the district court's decision *de novo*. *See Lax v. Mayorkas*, 20 F.4th 1178, 1181 (7th Cir. 2021). The only basis for relief that Williams invokes in his second suit is "retaliation." To state a Title VII claim for retaliation, Williams must plead that he "engaged in statutorily protected activity and was subjected to adverse employment action as a result of that activity." *Luevano v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc.*, 722 F.3d 1014, 1029 (7th Cir. 2013). But he can plead himself out of court by alleging "facts that establish an impenetrable defense to [his] claims." *Epstein v. Epstein*, 843 F.3d 1147, 1150 (7th Cir. 2016) (citation omitted).

Williams has pleaded himself out of court. Under the most generous reading of the amended complaint, Williams alleges that his supervisor subjected him to the adverse action of maintenance work in retaliation for his first suit. But Williams is not seeking relief in this suit from the burden of maintenance work. Rather, he seeks relief from Multi-Color only for firing him. Yet the firing was not unlawfully retaliatory: He alleges that his discharge occurred because, as he also stated in his administrative charge, he quarreled with his supervisor over a work request and grew insubordinate. Employers may discharge insubordinate workers. *See Hottenroth v. Vill. of Slinger*, 388 F.3d 1015, 1031–32 (7th Cir. 2004); *Lenoir v. Roll Coater, Inc.*, 13 F.3d 1130, 1134 (7th Cir. 1994). And Williams was not singled out for insubordination, because, as he also alleges, Multi-Color has fired other workers who quarreled with the same supervisor. Thus, Williams pleaded himself out of court on his retaliatory-discharge claim under Title VII. (Because we reach this conclusion, we need not address whether the court was also correct in its analysis of the exhaustion defense.)

Although Williams does not challenge the district court's refusal to allow him to amend his complaint, we agree on plenary review that an amendment would be futile

No. 24-2263

Page 4

here. *See Runnion ex rel. Runnion v. Girl Scouts of Greater Chi. & Nw. Ind.*, 786 F.3d 510, 524 (7th Cir. 2015) (review is de novo when basis for denying leave to amend is futility). A second amended complaint could not remedy the already-pleaded allegations that are fatal to his claim—namely, that Multi-Color had a legitimate reason to fire him and that it had fired other employees for similar behavior.

AFFIRMED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
United States Courthouse
Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

FINAL JUDGMENT

January 27, 2025

Before

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*
THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*
NANCY L. MALDONADO, *Circuit Judge*

CERTIFIED COPY



| | |
|---|--|
| No. 24-2263 | CHAD B. WILLIAMS, Plaintiff - Appellant v. MULTI-COLOR CORPORATION, Defendant - Appellee |
| Originating Case Information: | |
| District Court No: 2:23-cv-01643-LA Eastern District of Wisconsin District Judge Lynn Adelman | |

The judgment of the District Court is **AFFIRMED**, with costs, in accordance with the decision of this court entered on this date.

Clerk of Court

form name: c7_FinalJudgment (form ID: 132)

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Everett McKinley Dirksen
 United States Courthouse
 Room 2722 - 219 S. Dearborn Street
 Chicago, Illinois 60604



Office of the Clerk
 Phone: (312) 435-5850
www.ca7.uscourts.gov

CERTIFIED COPY

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF MANDATE

February 18, 2025

To: Gina M. Colletti
 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 Eastern District of Wisconsin
 Milwaukee, WI 53202-0000



| | |
|---|--|
| No. 24-2263 | CHAD B. WILLIAMS, Plaintiff - Appellant v. MULTI-COLOR CORPORATION, Defendant - Appellee |
| Originating Case Information: | |
| District Court No: 2:23-cv-01643-LA Eastern District of Wisconsin District Judge Lynn Adelman | |

Herewith is the mandate of this court in this appeal, along with the Bill of Costs, if any. A certified copy of the opinion/order of the court and judgment, if any, and any direction as to costs shall constitute the mandate.

RECORD ON APPEAL STATUS:

No record to be returned

form name: c7_Mandate (form ID: 135)

United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CHAD B. WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff

v.

CASE NUMBER: 23-C-1643

MULTI-COLOR CORPORATION,
Defendant

- Jury Verdict.** This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.
- Decision by Court.** This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the complaint and this action are dismissed with prejudice.

7/8/2024
Date

Gina M. Colletti
Clerk

/s/ Alexis H.
(By) Deputy Clerk

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 23, 2024*
Decided January 24, 2024

Before

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*

JOHN Z. LEE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-2457

CHAD WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

MULTI-COLOR CORPORATION, INC.,
Defendant-Appellee.

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

No. 19-C-0847

Lynn Adelman,
Judge.

ORDER

After Chad Williams was passed over for two promotions with Multi-Color Corporation, he sued the company for racial discrimination in violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2. The district court ultimately entered summary judgment for the company because Williams did not provide evidence of a

* 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).

discriminatory motive, let alone evidence that the company's proffered reasons for its decisions were pretext for discrimination.

On appeal, Williams generally challenges the court's ruling but does not address its reasoning or provide any meaningful basis for disturbing the judgment. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8) (brief must contain the appellant's "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which the appellant relies"); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). Although we are mindful that Williams is representing himself on appeal, it is not our role to craft parties' arguments for them, and even self-represented parties must comply with Rule 28(a). *See* *Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022).

DISMISSED

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
COMPLAINT EASTERN DISTRICT - WI
(for non-prisoner filers without lawyers)
FILED
2023 DEC -1 P : 00
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

(Full name of plaintiff(s))

Chad Bernard Williams Sr.

2920 N. 26th St.

Milwaukee, WI. 53206

v.

Case Number:

23-cv-1643

(to be supplied by Clerk of Court)

(Full name of defendant(s))

Multi-Color Corporation

129 W 22960 Marjean Ln.

Waukesha, WI. 53186

A. PARTIES

1. Plaintiff is a citizen of Wisconsin and resides at
(State)

2920 N. 26th St. Milwaukee

(Address)

(If more than one plaintiff is filing, use another piece of paper.)

2. Defendant Multi-Color Corporation
(Name)

Complaint - 1

is (if a person or private corporation) a citizen of Wisconsin
(State, if known)
and (if a person) resides at N29 W22960 Marjean Ln. Waukesha
(Address, if known)
and (if the defendant harmed you while doing the defendant's job)

worked for _____
(Employer's name and address, if known)

(If you need to list more defendants, use another piece of paper.)

B. STATEMENT OF CLAIM

On the space provided on the following pages, tell:

1. Who violated your rights;
2. What each defendant did;
3. When they did it;
4. Where it happened; and
5. Why they did it, if you know.

On August 12, 2008, I, Chad G. Williams, began my employment with the Multi-Color Corporation located in Waukesha, WI. I filed discrimination in June 2018 after I did not receive a promotion I truly deserved. After years of egregious acts of retaliation, I was wrongfully terminated on October 23, 2022. I request the following relief: 1) Full back pay and compensatory damages. 2) Damages for emotional distress and punitive damages. 3) Attorney and court fees.

Complaint – 3

C. JURISDICTION

I am suing for a violation of federal law under 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

OR

1

I am suing under state law. The state citizenship of the plaintiff(s) is (are) different from the state citizenship of every defendant, and the amount of money at stake in this case (not counting interest and costs) is \$ _____.

D. RELIEF WANTED

Describe what you want the Court to do if you win your lawsuit. Examples may include an award of money or an order telling defendants to do something or to stop doing something.

E. JURY DEMAND

I want a jury to hear my case.

- YES - NO

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Complaint signed this 7th day of December 2023.

Respectfully Submitted,

Chad B. Williams Jr.

Signature of Plaintiff

(414) 215-1126

Plaintiff's Telephone Number

meloria@att.net

Plaintiff's Email Address

2920 N. 26th St. Milwaukee, WI 53206

(Mailing Address of Plaintiff)

(If more than one plaintiff, use another piece of paper.)

REQUEST TO PROCEED IN DISTRICT COURT WITHOUT PREPAYING THE
FILING FEE

I DO request that I be allowed to file this complaint without paying the filing fee. I have completed a Request to Proceed in District Court without Prepaying the Filing Fee form and have attached it to the complaint.

I DO NOT request that I be allowed to file this complaint without prepaying the filing fee under 28 U.S.C. § 1915, and I have included the full filing fee with this complaint.

United States District Court

EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

JUDGMENT IN A CIVIL CASE

CHAD WILLIAMS,
Plaintiff

v.

CASE NUMBER: 19-C-0847

MULTI-COLOR CORPORATION, INC.,
Defendant

- Jury Verdict.** This action came before the Court for a trial by jury. The issues have been tried and the jury has rendered its verdict.
- Decision by Court.** This action came to trial or hearing before the Court. The issues have been tried or heard and a decision has been rendered.

IT IS ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that plaintiff shall take nothing by his complaint and judgment is entered in favor of defendant on the merits.

July 19, 2023
Date

Gina M. Colletti
Clerk

s/ K. Rafalski
(By) Deputy Clerk

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

CHAD WILLIAMS
2920 N. 26th St.
Milwaukee, WI 53206

Plaintiff,

Case No.:

19-c-0847

v.

FORT DEARBORN CO.
1530 MORSE AVE.
ELK GROVE VILLAGE IL 60007

U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT WI
FILED
2019 JUN -6 PM 04
CLERK
NCL GRAPHICS

PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT FOR DISCRIMINATION UNDER
TITLE VII

Now before the Court comes the Plaintiff Chad Williams who states the following:

1. Chad Williams is an adult resident of Milwaukee County and resides at 2920 N. 26th St. Milwaukee WI 53206.
2. Fort Dearborn Co is a domestic business with it's principal office located at 1530 Morse Ave. Elk Grove Village, IL 60007.
3. NCL Graphic Specialties is a division of the Defendant with it's principal office at N29W22960 Marjean Ln Waukesha WI 53186.
4. Mr. Williams is a present employee of the Defendant and has worked as a "Cutting Operator" for Defendant's division of NCL Graphics(hereinafter Defendant) since June of 2008.

5. During his time with the Defendant the Mr. Williams never had any significant disciplinary infractions.
6. His reviews as a cutter operator were very positive throughout the duration of his employment.
7. In January of 2018 two team lead positions became open within the Cutting Department and Mr. Williams applied for a position as a team lead.
8. Shortly thereafter Mr. Williams learned that the positions had been given to two other employees named Laura, who had worked for the Defendant for 8 years, and Bill, who worked for the Defendant than 5 years.
9. Compared to both employees Chad had worked for the Defendant for a longer period of time and prior to the promotions Chad was able to run more types of machines than the employees promoted.
10. Mr. Williams is able to run the flat bed machine, primary cutter, dye cutter 1-3(each are different machines and different sizes) and the round corner machines. In addition Mr. Williams is able to run the "auto trim."
11. In contrast Laura and Bill have been able to operate the primary cutter. When they run other machines, other employees have to assist them.
12. Typically a team lead would know how to use every machine. This is an essential function because team leads need to be able to fill any vacant position should an employee call in sick or be absent. In addition team leads are responsible for training new employees, neither Laura nor Bill would be capable of training new employees on the other machines for which they would be responsible.
13. When Mr. Williams approached production manager John Hitesman about these promotions he informed Mr. Williams that he needed the intelligence of the employees promoted. This justification is a pre-textual, neither employee were as qualified as Mr. Williams and one year later neither employee is fully capable of performing all of the functions of team lead.

CLAIM I: DISPARATE TREATMENT BASED ON RACE:

14. Plaintiff incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 13.

15. Neither Laura nor Bill were as qualified for the position of team lead as Mr. Williams and neither employee had as much seniority.
16. When the Defendant promoted less qualified personnel over Mr. Williams they discriminated against him on the basis of race.

Wherefore the Plaintiff requests the following relief:

- A. Full back pay and compensatory damages.
- B. Damages for emotional distress and punitive damages.
- C. Reasonable Attorney's fees.
- D. Whatever relief this Court deems just.

Dated this 6th day of June 2019.

Chad Williams

Plaintiff

Chad Williams