

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

PETER MAKUSI OTEMBA OWUOR,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 2:09cv1166-ID
	)	(WO)
U.S. DEPT. OF HOMELAND	)	
SECURITY, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER ON MOTION**

Pending before the court is Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel. (Doc. No. 54.) A plaintiff in a civil case has no constitutional right to counsel. While an indigent plaintiff may be appointed counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), a court retains broad discretion in making this decision. *See Killian v. Holt*, 166 F.3d 1156, 1157 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1999).

Here, the court finds from its review of the complaint that Plaintiff is able to adequately articulate the facts and grounds for relief in the instant matter without notable difficulty. Furthermore, the court concludes that Plaintiff’s complaint is not of undue complexity and that he has not shown that there are exceptional circumstances justifying appointment of counsel. *See Kilgo v. Ricks*, 983 F.2d 189, 193 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1993); *Dean v. Barber*, 951 F.2d 1210, 1216 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1992); *see also Fowler v. Jones*, 899 F.2d 1088, 1096 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1990). As such, the interests of justice do not compel appointment of

counsel at this time. Therefore, in the exercise of its discretion, the court shall deny Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel at this time. The request may be reconsidered if warranted by further developments in this case.

Accordingly, it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 54), is DENIED.

Done this 4<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2010.

/s/Charles S. Coody  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE