

**FILED**  
**United States Court of Appeals**  
**Tenth Circuit**

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS**  
**FOR THE TENTH CIRCUIT**

**February 24, 2021**

**Christopher M. Wolpert**  
**Clerk of Court**

---

YONNAS SEY FU PARKER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

CATHY ANDERSON,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 20-2090  
(D.C. No. 1:20-CV-00016-KG-KK)  
(D. N.M.)

---

**ORDER AND JUDGMENT\***

---

Before **PHILLIPS, McHUGH**, and **CARSON**, Circuit Judges.

---

Representing himself, Yonnas Sey Fu Parker appeals from the district court’s dismissal of his lawsuit. Exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, we affirm.

Mr. Parker’s complaint referred to Social Security disability benefits, but he used the court’s form for civil rights suits. The district court issued two orders discussing why his complaint was insufficient and directing him to explain his claims, but he did not respond. The district court thus dismissed the suit.

---

\* After examining the brief and appellate record, this panel has determined unanimously that oral argument would not materially assist in the determination of this appeal. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2); 10th Cir. R. 34.1(G). The case is therefore ordered submitted without oral argument. This order and judgment is not binding precedent, except under the doctrines of law of the case, *res judicata*, and collateral estoppel. It may be cited, however, for its persuasive value consistent with Fed. R. App. P. 32.1 and 10th Cir. R. 32.1.

On appeal, Mr. Parker’s opening brief asserts “Social Security Disability” as the entire Statement of the Case, and “PTSD, Injured to a limb on my body[,] Broken Knee, Lacerations to body” as the entire Statement of Facts. Opening Br. at 2. The only other information in the brief is a request that this court “Correct Social Security Decision.” *Id.* at 4.

“The first task of an appellant is to explain to us why the district court’s decision was wrong.” *Nixon v. City & Cnty. of Denver*, 784 F.3d 1364, 1366 (10th Cir. 2015). When people represent themselves, we read their filings liberally. *See Garrett v. Selby Connor Maddux & Janer*, 425 F.3d 836, 840 (10th Cir. 2005). But “the court cannot take on the responsibility of serving as the litigant’s attorney in constructing arguments and searching the record.” *Id.* Mr. Parker’s opening brief does not discuss why the district court dismissed his suit or otherwise present any issues for us to consider, and we cannot act as his attorney by searching for reasons to reverse the district court’s judgment. We therefore have no choice but to affirm the dismissal of the suit.

The district court’s judgment is affirmed.

Entered for the Court

Gregory A. Phillips  
Circuit Judge