

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
MICHIGAN, SOUTHERN DIVISION

Cary Cosgrove v. Rasco, et al.

Case No. 25-11159 · No. 25-11159 · Decided March 3, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan denies Cary Cosgrove’s motion seeking to require jail staff to sign logs for all incoming and outgoing mail. The court concludes that the motion is based on allegations already presented in the complaint, cites no supporting authority, and does not identify a clear procedural mechanism for the requested relief. The order states that the underlying issues will be litigated in due course.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Curtis Ivy, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division
DECIDED	March 3, 2026
DOCKET	25-11159
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for an order requiring defendants to sign a mail log for every piece of incoming or outgoing mail received on his behalf. The motion was referred to a magistrate judge for all pretrial matters and was denied.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The order states that objections to the magistrate judge's ruling on the nondispositive motion may be filed under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(a) and Eastern District of Michigan Local Rule 72.1(d); no separate merits standard of review was applied.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	Cary Cosgrove v. Rasco, et al.

TOPICS

prisoners rights

civil procedure

pleadings

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure

civil rights

prisoner litigation

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiff's Motion for Order should be granted when it cited no legal authority, did not identify a clear procedural mechanism for the requested relief, and substantially repeated allegations already presented in the complaint.

HOLDINGS

1. The motion was denied because plaintiff cited no authority supporting the requested mail-log requirement, failed to identify a clear procedural mechanism for obtaining the relief, and raised issues that would be litigated through the complaint.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Even in pleadings drafted by pro se parties, “‘courts should not have to guess at the nature of the claim asserted.’”” (Order at PageID.29)

“As the bases for bringing the motion are the same as the bases alleged in his Complaint, the issues raised in this motion will be litigated in due course.” (Order at PageID.29)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Plaintiff, a detainee or prisoner, alleged that jail staff denied him pencils, paper, envelopes, and standardized legal forms; opened mail outside his presence; caused mail delays; and denied copies of his medical records. In the motion, he requested that defendants be required to sign a mail log for every incoming or outgoing piece of mail received on his behalf.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiff filed a prisoner civil-rights complaint alleging restrictions on writing materials, interference with mail, delays in receiving mail, denial of standardized legal forms, and denial of medical-record copies. He then filed the present Motion for Order, which repeated or overlapped with the bases of the complaint. The magistrate judge denied the motion because plaintiff cited no supporting authority and did not identify a clear procedural mechanism for obtaining the requested relief apart from the relief sought in the complaint.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Frengler v. Gen. Motors*, 482 F. App'x 975, 976–77 (6th Cir. 2012)

- Wells v. Brown, 891 F.2d 591, 594 (6th Cir. 1989)
- Rogers v. Detroit Police Dep't, 595 F. Supp. 2d 757, 766 (E.D. Mich. 2009)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/state/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-michigan-southern-division-united-states-di/2026/cary-cosgrove-v-rasco-et-al-2sfjhz80>