

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 27, 2026*

Decided January 28, 2026

BeforeMICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*CANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-3022

BRYON CHAMP,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*SHIRLEY FORCUM, et al.,
*Defendants-Appellees.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of Illinois.

No. 3:19-CV-263-MAB

Mark A. Beatty,
*Magistrate Judge.***ORDER**

Bryon Champ, formerly confined at a mental health facility as a pretrial detainee, challenges the summary judgment rejecting his conditions-of-confinement claim against the facility staff. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Because Champ does not present any ground for reversal, we dismiss this appeal.

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the appeal is frivolous. FED. R. APP. P. 34(a)(2)(A).

This appeal is the last in a series of civil rights suits filed by Champ when he was confined at Chester Medical Health Center in 2018. In this suit, he alleged that the water to his toilet was shut off for 55 days as punishment for failing to report his bowel movements to staff, in accordance with facility policy. The district court allowed him to proceed under the Fourteenth Amendment on a claim that he was subjected to unconstitutional conditions of confinement. The court recruited successive attorneys to assist Champ. After the second attorney (who had assisted Champ for about nine months) asked—and was allowed to—withdraw from the case, the court informed Champ that he needed to file a new motion for recruitment of counsel by the end of December 2022 if he wanted the court to find a new attorney for him. Champ moved for recruitment of counsel. The court denied the motion but invited Champ to refile if he provided more information about his personal characteristics (e.g., education level and intellectual capacity, ability to read and write, litigation experience, mental health and medical history, physical limitations) and current circumstances (e.g., access to the law library, availability of assistance from other inmates, access to writing supplies).

Defendants moved in early 2023 for summary judgment, and Champ filed additional requests for counsel. The court eventually denied each of Champ's requests and granted defendants' motion for summary judgment, which Champ had not responded to. The court independently reviewed the record, found undisputed the evidence that Champ's water was turned back on as needed throughout the day, and concluded that no reasonable jury could find that periodically shutting off his toilet water posed any objectively serious threat to his health.

On appeal, Champ's brief does not challenge any aspect of the district court's decision and instead merely alludes to sources of federal jurisdiction and his request for a declaratory judgment. This is insufficient; Champ's brief must contain his "contentions and the reasons for them, with citations to the authorities and parts of the record on which [he] relies." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(8)(A); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001). Because Champ's brief does not comply with this Rule, we dismiss his appeal.

DISMISSED