

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 April 15, 2024*

Decided April 17, 2024

Before

MICHAEL B. BRENNAN, *Circuit Judge*

MICHAEL Y. SCUDDER, *Circuit Judge*

JOSHUA P. KOLAR, *Circuit Judge*

No. 23-2281

HELENE TONIQUE LAURENT
MILLER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS,

Defendant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District
Court for the Northern District of
Illinois, Eastern Division.

No. 18 CV 05213

Rebecca R. Pallmeyer,
Chief Judge.

* We have agreed to decide the case without oral argument because the Appellant's brief and the 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

Helene Miller, who has used several different names on her many federal complaints, including “Helene Re Re T. Williams” and “Helene Tonique Williams,” is a restricted filer in the Northern District of Illinois. She appeals multiple decisions by the Executive Committee of the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, relating to her filing restrictions. But rather than pointing to any errors in the orders she is appealing, Miller simply asks us to lift her restricted-filer status. Because she presents us with no arguments, we dismiss her appeal.

Miller has a history of filing frivolous and often (but not always) repetitive federal lawsuits. On July 31, 2018, the Executive Committee designated Miller as a restricted filer after she filed 10 lawsuits in the Northern District of Illinois between June 19, 2018, and July 31, 2018. Pursuant to its order, Miller must seek leave from the Executive Committee to file new civil complaints, and each complaint must be accompanied by an affidavit stating that the claims were not already raised in a previous lawsuit. Miller’s appeal of this order was dismissed for failure to prosecute.

Miller was not deterred from filing new lawsuits, and in February 2023, the Executive Committee entered a \$500 sanction and, until she paid it, a filing bar pursuant to *Support Systems International, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995). In the months that followed, the Executive Committee resolved three cases that had been referred to it pursuant to its 2018 and 2023 filing restrictions. As relevant for this appeal, the Executive Committee dismissed two of Miller’s lawsuits (Nos. 23-cv-00084 & 22-cv-7165) and denied her leave to file a complaint in a third lawsuit (No. 22-cv-03308), all because she failed to comply with the terms of her filing restrictions; for example, she did not seek leave from the Executive Committee before filing new suits. Without paying the \$500 fine, Miller moved to rescind the *Mack* bar, but the Executive Committee denied the motion.

Miller, who paid the appellate filing fee, now challenges each of these decisions.¹ But, in her appellate brief, she does not attempt to explain why any of these decisions

¹ She also appeals an order denying her motion for leave to appeal in forma pauperis with respect to one of the dismissed cases (No. 23-cv-00084). However, before the Executive Committee addressed the motion, we had already dismissed the corresponding appeal because there was not yet any final appealable order. *See* App. No. 23-1077. Later, the Executive Committee dismissed the underlying case, and that

are erroneous. Nor does she attempt to show that any of the three underlying cases should have been allowed to proceed. Instead, she simply requests that we remove all her filing restrictions. But in appeal no. 18-3339 she unsuccessfully appealed the original imposition of filing restrictions in 2018. And in this appeal, she does not explain why further restrictions associated with her unpaid fine are erroneous or why she should be permitted to appeal them all without having complied with the Executive Committee's terms for modifying or rescinding the *Mack* order (paying the fine or, after two years, demonstrating inability to pay). Miller's appellate brief also discusses her desire to pay all filing fees as a "settlement," but it is unclear what matter or matters Miller seeks to settle, and, in any case, we are not the court to do it.

Although she is a pro se litigant, Miller is required to comply with Rule 28(a) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure by, among other things, raising a discernible argument for reversal. See *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001); see also *Greenbank v. Great Am. Assurance Co.*, 47 F.4th 618, 629 (7th Cir. 2022) (appellant is obligated to argue why the judgment should be reversed). Miller does not give us any arguments specific to the decisions she appealed, and so we dismiss the appeal. See *Anderson*, 241 F.3d at 545–46.

We have previously warned Miller that we may impose sanctions for pursuing frivolous appeals. See *Williams v. Preckwinkle*, 782 F. App'x 493 (7th Cir. 2019). She has not heeded this warning, nor has she been deterred by the district court's filing restrictions and other sanctions. We therefore find it appropriate to further sanction Miller. We order that, until Miller pays her financial sanctions in full, as well as all outstanding filing fees in the courts within this Circuit, the clerk of this court, and the clerks of all district courts within this circuit, are directed to return unfiled any papers submitted by Miller directly, using any of the names she has litigated under, or by anyone on her behalf. See *In re City of Chi.*, 500 F.3d 582, 585–86 (7th Cir. 2007); *Support Sys. Int'l, Inc. v. Mack*, 45 F.3d 185, 186 (7th Cir. 1995). This order will be lifted upon full payment. See *City of Chicago*, 500 F.3d at 585–86. If Miller, despite her best efforts, is unable to pay what she owes, she is authorized to submit to this court a motion to modify or rescind this order no earlier than two years from the date of this order. See *id.*;

decision is among those Miller now appeals. Her appellate filing status is resolved, and so there is nothing for us to address with respect to the denial of IFP status (Doc. No. 108 in the matter on appeal).

Mack, 45 F.3d at 186. This filing bar excludes criminal cases and applications for writs of habeas corpus. *See Mack*, 45 F.3d at 186.

DISMISSED