Tebo v. Moss et al Doc. 16

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

Plaintiff,

NANCY ANNE TEBO,

**DECISION & ORDER** 

11-CV-6503P

v.

CHRISTOPHER MOSS, Sheriff, LT. DANIEL MANDELL and CAPTAIN CHARLES WILSON,

Defendants.

Plaintiff Nancy Anne Tebo ("Tebo") has filed this lawsuit against defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging that defendants have violated her constitutional rights by denying her medical treatment and denying her access to an attorney. (Docket # 1). Currently pending before the Court is plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. (Docket # 11).

It is well-settled that there is no constitutional right to appointed counsel in civil cases. Although the Court may appoint counsel to assist indigent litigants pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), see, e.g., Sears, Roebuck and Co. v. Charles W. Sears Real Estate, Inc., 865 F.2d 22, 23 (2d Cir. 1988), such assignment of counsel is clearly within the judge's discretion. In re Martin-Trigona, 737 F.2d 1254 (2d Cir. 1984). The factors to be considered in deciding whether or not to assign counsel include the following:

- 1. Whether the indigent's claims seem likely to be of substance;
- 2. Whether the indigent is able to investigate the crucial facts concerning his claim;

- 3. Whether conflicting evidence implicating the need for cross-examination will be the major proof presented to the fact finder;
- 4. Whether the legal issues involved are complex; and
- 5. Whether there are any special reasons why appointment of counsel would be more likely to lead to a just determination.

Hendricks v. Coughlin, 114 F.3d 390, 392 (2d Cir. 1997); see also Hodge v. Police Officers, 802 F.2d 58 (2d Cir. 1986).

The Court must consider the issue of appointment carefully, of course, because "every assignment of a volunteer lawyer to an undeserving client deprives society of a volunteer lawyer available for a deserving cause." *Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., Inc.*, 877 F.2d 170, 172 (2d Cir. 1989). Therefore, the Court must first look to the "likelihood of merit" of the underlying dispute, *Hendricks v. Coughlin*, 114 F.3d at 392; *Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., Inc.*, 877 F.2d at 174, and "even though a claim may not be characterized as frivolous, counsel should not be appointed in a case where the merits of the . . . claim are thin and his chances of prevailing are therefore poor." *Carmona v. United States Bureau of Prisons*, 243 F.3d 629, 632 (2d Cir. 2001) (denying counsel on appeal where petitioner's appeal was not frivolous but nevertheless appeared to have little merit).

The Court has reviewed the facts presented herein in light of the factors required by law and finds, pursuant to the standards promulgated by *Hendricks*, 114 F.3d at 392, and *Hodge v. Police Officers*, 802 F.2d at 58, that the appointment of counsel is not necessary at this time. As stated above, a plaintiff seeking the appointment of counsel must demonstrate a likelihood of success on the merits. *See id.* This, plaintiff has failed to do. In addition, the court

notes that there is a limited number of local attorneys available to handle cases on a pro bono

basis. Cooper v. A. Sargenti Co., Inc., 877 F.2d at 172 ("every assignment of a volunteer lawyer

to an undeserving client deprives society of a volunteer lawyer available for a deserving cause").

Based on this review, plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Docket # 11) is DENIED

without prejudice at this time. It is plaintiff's responsibility, therefore, to retain an attorney or

press forward with this action pro se.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Marian W. Payson

MARIAN W. PAYSON United States Magistrate Judge

Dated: Rochester, New York

October 2 , 2012

3