

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 9, 2025*

Decided October 10, 2025

BeforeDAVID F. HAMILTON, *Circuit Judge*DORIS L. PRYOR, *Circuit Judge*JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-1749

CLARENCE H. MITCHELL,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTHCARE AND FAMILY
SERVICES, DIVISION OF CHILD
SUPPORT SERVICES,
*Defendant-Appellee.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 1:25-cv-02004

Georgia N. Alexakis,
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

Clarence Mitchell brought this lawsuit against the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services, broadly challenging the constitutionality of child support. The district court ruled that the complaint did not contain a “short and plain statement” of the claim, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 8(a), dismissed it, and invited Mitchell to amend. He did so. The amended complaint mirrored the earlier one, adding only a quotation that disparaged administrative law judges. The court then dismissed the complaint with prejudice for failure to comply with Rule 8(a).

Mitchell now challenges the district court’s ruling, asserting that the judge did not read his arguments. But the judge rightly determined that Mitchell’s pleading ran afoul of Rule 8(a). Mitchell has yet to clarify the nature of his claims, the relief he seeks, or the source of the court’s jurisdiction. The judge acted well within her discretion to dismiss an amended complaint like Mitchell’s that did not attempt to address the defects of the prior pleading. *See Fosnight v. Jones*, 41 F.4th 916, 924–25 (7th Cir. 2022).

Mitchell also asserts that the court ruled against him because of bias. But he provides no evidence to support this assertion, and judicial determinations alone almost never establish bias. *See Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555–56 (1994).

This is Mitchell’s fifth lawsuit arising from the same set of circumstances to be dismissed. *See Mitchell v. Contra Costa Cnty. Dep’t of Child Support Customer Serv.*, No. 18-CV-07356 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 28, 2018); *Mitchell v. Contra Costa Cnty. Dep’t of Child Support Customer Serv.*, No. 18-CV-08131 (N.D. Ill. Jan. 9, 2019); *Mitchell v. Sonoma Cnty. Dep’t of Child Support Servs.*, No. 19-CV-00223 (N.D. Ill. Feb. 25, 2020); *Mitchell v. Cal. Dep’t of Health & Fam. Servs.*, No. 20-CV-01588 (N.D. Ill. Sep. 27, 2024); *Mitchell v. Ill. Dep’t of Healthcare & Fam. Servs. Div. of Child Support Servs.*, No. 25-CV-02004 (N.D. Ill. Apr. 10, 2025). Mitchell is warned that further frivolous filings may result in sanctions including a fine and filing bar. *See Support Sys. Int’l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186–87 (7th Cir. 1995).

AFFIRMED