STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

ANTONIO BRIDGES #437651,

Plaintiff,

v

Case No. 26-000139-MB

MICHIGAN PAROLE BOARD,

Hon. Michael F. Gadola

Defendant.
_____ /

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR COURT CLERK TO PROVIDE FREE COPY OF SUMMONS AND FOR ALTERNATE SERVICE OF PROCESS AND MANNER OF SERVICE

Plaintiff filed this lawsuit on June 29, 2026. He moved, on the same day, for a waiver of fees. In a separate motion, plaintiff requested a free copy of the summons and alternate service of process. Plaintiff cites MCR 2.105(I), which permits service of process on a defendant by serving a summons and copy of the complaint on an agent authorized by written appointment or by law to receive service of process. Plaintiff maintains that Michigan Department of Corrections policy prohibits him from obtaining an indigent loan for copy costs or certified mail associated with service of process of a lawsuit. On July 2, 2026, this Court entered an order denying plaintiff's motion for waiver of fees, which ordered, in relevant part, that plaintiff must refile the complaint within 21 days pursuant to MCL 600.2963. Plaintiff filed an amended complaint on July 14, 2026. The Court now addresses plaintiff's motion for a free copy of the summons form and for alternate service of process.

Upon review of the motion, it is DENIED because costs associated with service of process are not filing fees, and this Court lacks authority to waive them. See MCL 600.2963; MCR 2.002. The Court will provide plaintiff with a blank summons form. Plaintiff must complete the form and return the form to the Court for issuance. As for plaintiff's request for alternate service, MCR 2.105(J)(1) provides, "On a showing that service of process cannot reasonably be made as provided by this rule, the court may by order permit service of process to be made in any other manner reasonably calculated to give the defendant actual notice of the proceedings and an opportunity to be heard." Plaintiff has not set forth sufficient facts to show that service of process cannot reasonably be made under the court rule. Nor has he provided an alternative means of service that would be reasonably calculated to give defendant actual notice of the proceedings. Service must be accomplished as provided in the Michigan Court Rules.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: July 28, 2026

Hon. Michael F. Gadola
Chief Judge, Court of Claims