

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 March 28, 2025*

Decided April 3, 2025

BeforeFRANK H. EASTERBROOK, *Circuit Judge*KENNETH F. RIPPLE, *Circuit Judge*MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-3408

MAVERICK A. YOUNG,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*STATE OF INDIANA,
*Defendant-Appellee.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of
Indiana, Indianapolis Division.

No. 1:23-cv-01852-TWP-MG

Tanya Walton Pratt,
*Chief Judge.***ORDER**

Maverick Young initiated a lawsuit in federal court, requesting a legal name change, the removal of his parents' names from public records pertaining to him, and damages of \$50 billion. Although Young did not list any defendants in the case caption, the district court gleaned from his complaint that the states of Indiana and Illinois were the intended defendants. In the complaint and the many other documents he has filed

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

since, Young appears to allege that the states enabled ongoing abuse and neglect and failed to prosecute hate crimes against him. He invoked Title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000a; the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr. Hate Crimes Prevention Act, 18 U.S.C. § 249; and other “federal laws against discrimination.” He also refers to his status as an informant in Indiana and his protection under the federal Witness Security Program.

The district court reviewed Young’s complaint and dismissed it, concluding that Young failed to state a claim for relief. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2). The court also denied his “mostly incoherent” filings after the complaint. And it declined to allow Young to amend the complaint, explaining that the “fantastical nature” of his allegations and his frivolous litigation practices in other courts demonstrated that amendment would be futile. *See Zimmerman v. Bornick*, 25 F.4th 491, 494 (7th Cir. 2022).

Young appeals, but he has forfeited review on the merits by filing a brief that does not engage with the reasons the district court gave for dismissing the complaint. *See Klein v. O’Brien*, 884 F.3d 754, 757 (7th Cir. 2018). Instead, he recounts in detail the harm he alleges that the defendants (and many others) have inflicted on him. Although Young has no lawyer, he must still comply with Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, which requires him to file a brief with 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); *see Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022) (citing *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001)). We construe pro se filings generously, but “we must be able to discern cogent arguments in any appellate brief, even one from a pro se litigant,” and, if we cannot, we must dismiss the appeal. *Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545. Moreover, Young fails to explain how his claims are not barred by the Eleventh Amendment, which prohibits a state from being sued unless it consented to suit, or the plaintiff sues under a statute that carves out an exception to the state’s sovereign immunity. *See Fitzpatrick v. Bitzer*, 427 U.S. 445, 455–56 (1976). And to the extent that Young asserts a violation of the federal Constitution, a state is not a “person” subject to suit under § 1983. *Will v. Mich. Dep’t of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 64 (1989).

Young’s reply brief hints at new arguments concerning the district court’s refusal to allow him to amend his complaint, but arguments appearing for the first time in a reply brief are waived. *See White v. United States*, 8 F.4th 547, 552 (7th Cir. 2021). And regardless, Young’s cumulative filings establish that the district court was correct about the futility of allowing him to amend the complaint.

No. 23-3408

Page 3

All pending motions including Young's motion for oral argument are DENIED, and the appeal is DISMISSED.