



plaintiff's motion to file an amended complaint. The plaintiff, on July 15, 2011, filed her amended complaint, alleging a single count of battery, specifically that during the time the defendant was cohabiting with her, he forced her "to submit to sexual intercourse on repeated occasions while knowing that he was infected with Hepatitis C" without informing her that he was infected, and that she "would not have consented to said acts of sexual intercourse had the Defendant disclosed to the Plaintiff that he was infected with Hepatitis C."

¶ 4 In response to the plaintiff's amended complaint, the defendant filed a motion to dismiss, pursuant to section 2-619(a)(9) of the Code of Civil Procedure (735 ILCS 5/2-619(a)(9) (West 2010)), alleging that the plaintiff's amended complaint was defeated by affirmative matter, to wit, the affidavit of Dr. William F. Hays, which stated that as of the time of his examination of the defendant, the defendant "had never been infected with hepatitis C." On November 22, 2011, the circuit court, noting that the plaintiff had failed to file a response to the defendant's motion, granted the motion of the defendant. The plaintiff now appeals *pro se*.

¶ 5 The Original Complaint

¶ 6 In her brief, the plaintiff assigns several errors related to the dismissal of her original complaint. However, in her notice of appeal, she only "appeals to the Appellate Court the Order entered by the Circuit Court of Perry County [*sic*], Illinois dated November 22, 2011, wherein the Circuit Court dismissed the Complaint with prejudice." As the defendant points out, "[i]t is firmly established that this court has jurisdiction only over those matters which are raised in the notice of appeal." *Harvey v. Carponelli*, 117 Ill. App. 3d 448, 452 (1983) (citing *Illinois Central Gulf R.R. Co. v. Sankey Bros., Inc.*, 78 Ill. 2d 56 (1979); *Lewanski v. Lewanski*, 59 Ill. App. 3d 805 (1978)). "[A]n unspecified order is reviewable only where it is a step in the 'procedural progression' leading to the judgment specified in the notice of appeal." *In re Marriage of O'Brien*, 393 Ill. App. 3d 364, 371-72 (2009) (quoting *Jiffy Lube*



¶ 9 In this case, the plaintiff has submitted a labyrinth of strange pagination and incomprehensible statements. We agree with the defendant that the plaintiff's brief is "woefully deficient." While the plaintiff provides issue statements that address the dismissal of her amended complaint, her brief does not appear to contain any arguments on point other than broad constitutional pronouncements for which she provides no connection to the dismissal of her amended complaint. Her reply brief argues that the "[a]ffidavits of William F. Hays, M.D., was not a medical flow sheet that would have given full blood and bodily test to prove up" and that "the courts should have had a Independent Medical Doctor to test both Appellant/Plaintiff and Appellee Defendant." Her reply brief also provides several broad constitutional pronouncements for which she makes no connection to the present appeal. While the plaintiff alleges that the court erred when it dismissed her amended complaint, she does not allege that the defendant did not meet his initial burden on the motion by providing the affidavit of Dr. Hays. Indeed, the plaintiff did not respond to the defendant's motion at all, thereby admitting all facts contained in the defendant's motion. Therefore, the circuit court did not err in granting the defendant's motion to dismiss.

¶ 10 CONCLUSION

¶ 11 The judgment of the circuit court is affirmed.

¶ 12 Affirmed.