

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

CHRISTOPHER W. WEBB,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. CIV 10-425-FHS-SPS
)	
DAVID MICHAEL CATHEY,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING SECOND MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Plaintiff has filed a second motion for appointment of counsel, alleging he is a layman and this case involves very complex and sensitive documents [Docket No. 29]. He still bears the burden of convincing the court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant appointment of counsel. *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing *United States v. Masters*, 484 F.2d 1251, 1253 (10th Cir. 1973)).

The court again has reviewed plaintiff's claims, the nature of the factual issues, and his ability to investigate crucial facts. *McCarthy*, 753 F.2d at 838 (citing *Maclin v. Freake*, 650 F.2d 885, 887-88 (7th Cir. 1981)). After considering plaintiff's ability to present his claims and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims, the court finds that appointment of counsel still is not warranted. *See Williams v. Meese*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991); *see also Rucks v. Boergermann*, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995).

ACCORDINGLY, plaintiff's motion [Docket No. 29] is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 3rd day of April, 2013.


Frank H. Seay
United States District Judge