

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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

BeforeMICHAEL 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).

No. 23-2457

Page 2

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