

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 February 24, 2026*

Decided February 25, 2026

BeforeMICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Chief Judge*THOMAS L. KIRSCH II, *Circuit Judge*JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 25-2112

DAVID J. MCNAMARA,
*Plaintiff-Appellant,**v.*L. EDWARD STENGEL, et al.,
*Defendants-Appellees.*Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Eastern District of
Wisconsin.

No. 25-cv-0579-bhl

Brett H. Ludwig,
Judge.

* The appellees were not served with process and are 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

David McNamara appeals the judgment dismissing his civil-rights suit for failure to state a claim. Because McNamara does not present any ground for reversal, we dismiss this appeal.

In 2025, McNamara sued current and former officials of Wisconsin (two judges who adjudicated proceedings involving him, a prosecuting attorney who prosecuted him, two state child-support employees who had telephone conversations with him in the mid-1990s, and a former Wisconsin Governor and Attorney General) for allegedly unfair court proceedings arising from his failure to make child-support payments. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 1983. The district court screened his operative complaint, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B), and dismissed it for failure to state a claim. The court explained that McNamara's claims against the judges and prosecutor were barred by absolute immunity; that his claims against the remaining defendants for conduct that allegedly occurred in the 1990s were barred by the six-year statute of limitations then in effect, *see* WIS. STAT. § 893.53 (1980) (amended 2018); that any claims concerning his prior convictions or back payment were barred by *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486–87 (1994); and that any claims concerning his ongoing criminal proceedings were subject to abstention under *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 43–45 (1971).

On appeal, McNamara recites the facts of his child-support proceedings and the circumstances of his alleged disability, but he does not engage with the district court's decision that his complaint failed to state a claim. We are mindful of McNamara's pro se status, but he still must comply with Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure and include an argument explaining why the district court's decision was incorrect. *See Sullers v. Int'l Union Elevator Constructors, Local 2*, 141 F.4th 890, 895–96 (7th Cir. 2025); *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545–46 (7th Cir. 2001). Because McNamara does not develop an argument contesting the district court's rationale, we dismiss the appeal.

DISMISSED