STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

DR. UBONG CHRISTOPHER UBOKUDOM, D.O.,

Plaintiff,

v Case No. 26-000236-MM

STATE OF MICHIGAN, Hon. Michael F. Gadola

Defendant.
_____ /

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE CONSOLIDATED MOTION AND REQUEST FOR LEAVE TO ISSUE AMENDED SUMMONS AND FOR AUTHORIZATION OF ALTERNATIVE ELECTRONIC SERVICE PURSUANT TO MCR 2.102(C) AND MCR 2.105(J)(1)

On November 6, 2026, plaintiff filed this lawsuit. On November 13, plaintiff moved for alternative service and judicial guidance. On November 16, plaintiff moved for leave of the Court to issue an amended summons. On the same day, this Court granted plaintiff's motion for leave to issue an amended summons and denied plaintiff's motion for alternative service and judicial guidance as moot. This Court's clerk issued the amended summons on November 16. On November 17, plaintiff moved for leave of the Court to issue a second set of amended summonses and for authorization of alternative service via email, arguing that he is indigent and cannot afford to print and mail the documents by certified mail to four separate state agencies. Plaintiff requests an order allowing him to serve process via email.

Having reviewed the motion, it is DENIED. 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 made the required showing that service of process cannot reasonably be made as provided by the court rule. The State of Michigan is the only defendant in this case. Plaintiff has not demonstrated that he cannot serve process on the State by certified mail. Plaintiff further requests that this Court provide "judicial confirmation" of the service addresses for defendant. The Court declines to provide plaintiff with the requested information, which would amount to improper legal advice. See *Walters v Nadell*, 481 Mich 377, 388; 751 NW2d 431 (2008) ("Trial courts are not the research assistants of the litigants . . . ."). Finally, plaintiff has not demonstrated a need for a second amended summons. See MCR 2.102(C).

IT IS SO ORDERED. This order does not resolve the last pending claim and does not close the case.

Date: November 18, 2026

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