

**NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION**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 November 13, 2025\*

Decided November 13, 2025

**Before**MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Chief Judge*DIANE S. SYKES, *Circuit Judge*AMY J. ST. EVE, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-1333

YVETTE WALKER,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*HILTON HOTELS,  
*Defendant-Appellee.*Appeal from the United States District  
Court for the Northern District of  
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 1:24-cv-06607

John J. Tharp, Jr.,  
*Judge.*

---

\* The appellee was not served with process and is not participating in this appeal. We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the brief 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**

Yvette Walker appeals the judgment dismissing her employment-discrimination suit for failure to state a claim. Because Walker does not present any ground for reversal, we dismiss this appeal.

Walker sued her former employer, Hilton Hotels, for employment-related claims. In a 53-page complaint, supplemented by a 400-page appendix, she alleged that she was mistreated, denied promotions, and fired, among other grievances. At screening, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii), the judge dismissed Walker's complaint under Rule 8(a)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure because she had not stated her claims in short and plain terms nor explained which events provided the basis for her claims. She amended and shortened her complaint, but the judge dismissed it again because she did not explain how the listed events tied to the alleged wrongs. Her third attempt provided more facts and cited Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e-2, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, 29 U.S.C. § 623(a), but she did not allege that Hilton discriminated against her because of protected characteristics, so the judge dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim. *See Kaminski v. Elite Staffing, Inc.*, 23 F.4th 774, 777 (7th Cir. 2022). The fourth and fifth amended complaints were substantively identical to the third, and the judge dismissed those too.

On appeal, Walker does not contest the correctness of the district judge's decision, nor does she provide any case law or legal argument that would cast doubt on the ruling. Rather, she repeats the list of claims found in her third, fourth, and fifth amended complaints. But even pro se plaintiffs must comply with Rule 28 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, which requires a section of the brief containing "appellant's 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 Greenbank v. Great Am. Assurance Co.*, 47 F.4th 618, 629 (7th Cir. 2022). Because Walker's appellate filing presents no argument contesting the district judge's rationale, we dismiss the appeal. *See Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022).

DISMISSED