

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 October 21, 2025*

Decided October 24, 2025

BeforeCANDACE JACKSON-AKIWUMI, *Circuit Judge*JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*NANCY L. MALDONADO, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-1637

MATTHEW JONES,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
INDIANA,*Defendant-Appellee.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Southern District of
Indiana, Evansville Division.

No. 3:25-cv-00059-RLY-CSW

Richard L. Young,
*Judge.***ORDER**

Matthew Jones sued the United States District Court for Southern District of Indiana under 18 U.S.C. § 1114, a criminal statute penalizing the killing or attempted killing of a federal employee. He alleged that court employees attacked him while he was serving as a “U.S.A. Constituent.” The district court screened his complaint, *see* 28

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

No. 25-1637

Page 2

U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and dismissed it as barred by sovereign immunity and for lack of standing.

Jones appeals the district court's judgment but his appellate brief does not engage with the district court's reasoning. Although Jones is proceeding pro se, he must comply with Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure by including in his brief an argument that explains why the court's decision was incorrect. *Atkins v. Gilbert*, 52 F.4th 359, 361 (7th Cir. 2022). He does assert that the Southern District of Indiana negligently caused him serious bodily injuries, for which he says he incurred one trillion dollars in medical expenses. But arguments raised for the first time on appeal are waived. *Duncan Place Owners Ass'n v. Danze, Inc.*, 927 F.3d 970, 974 (7th Cir. 2019).

We close with a warning about sanctions. Although this is Jones's first case in this circuit, he has made similar frivolous allegations in nearly a dozen other federal and state courts. *See, e.g., Jones v. USA Dist. Ct. of E. Pa.*, No. 25-1414, 2025 WL 2126622 (3d Cir. July 29, 2025); *Jones v. Sussex Cnty. Super. Ct.*, No. 144, 2025, 2025 WL 2027979 (Del. July 18, 2025); *Jones v. Greenville Police Dep't*, No. 4:25-cv-48-DMB-JMV, 2025 WL 1749986 (N.D. Miss. June 2, 2025); *Jones v. Cleveland Hopkins Airport*, No. 1:25 CV 767, 2025 WL 1256727 (N.D. Ohio Apr. 30, 2025); *Jones v. Buckhannon-Upshur Cir. Ct.*, No. 2:25-CV-5, 2025 WL 2235430 (N.D. W. Va. Mar. 26, 2025). No one is "entitled to file an endless string of frivolous suits," and we "may halt the abuse of the judicial process" by issuing sanctions. *Reed v. PF of Milwaukee Midtown, LLC*, 16 F.4th 1229, 1232 (7th Cir. 2021). Jones is warned that further vexatious and frivolous filings may result in sanctions, including fines and a possible filing bar under *Support Sys. Int'l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186–87 (7th Cir. 1995).

DISMISSED