

NONPRECEDENTIAL DISPOSITION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 June 23, 2009*

Decided June 23, 2009

Before

RICHARD D. CUDAHY, *Circuit Judge*

RICHARD A. POSNER, *Circuit Judge*

TERENCE T. EVANS, *Circuit Judge*

No. 09-1570

NESER EM NEHEH ALI,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

CHICAGO BANCORP, INC., et. al,
Defendants-Appellees.

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

No. 08 C 6713

Matthew F. Kennelly,
Judge.

ORDER

Neser Em Neheh Ali sued Bancorp and other defendants for what appear to be commercial and contractual claims. His complaint is incoherent and contains no discernable claims, though Ali labels himself and the defendants as “vessels” in an attempt

* The defendants were not served with process in district court and are not participating in this appeal. After examining the appellant’s brief and the record, we have concluded that oral argument is unnecessary. Thus, the appeal is submitted on the appellant’s brief and the record. *See* FED R. APP P. 34(a)(2).

to invoke the admiralty jurisdiction of federal court. The district court dismissed the case for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

Ali's appellate brief is similarly incomprehensible. A litigant in this court must "supply an argument consisting of more than a generalized assertion of error, with citations to supporting authority." FED. R. APP. P. 28(a)(9)(A); see *Haxhiu v. Mukasey*, 519 F.3d 685, 691 (7th Cir. 2008). And although we construe pro se filings liberally, even litigants proceeding without the benefit of counsel must articulate some reason for disturbing the district court's judgment. See *Anderson v. Hardman*, 241 F.3d 544, 545 (7th Cir. 2001). Ali does not challenge the district court's reasoning. In fact, it is impossible to discern any argument at all.

DISMISSED.