

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TERRY WILLIAMS-ILUNGA,)	Case No. CV 12-08592 DDP (AJWx)
)	
Plaintiff,)	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST
)	FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
v.)	
)	[Dkt. No. 16]
ANDREA GONZALEZ; ANA TROVB-)	
WISNEV; PRODUCER-WRITERS)	
GUILD OF AMERICA PENSION)	
PLAN; TRUSTEES OF THE)	
PRODUCER-WRITERS GUILD OF)	
AMERICA; WRITERS GUILD OF)	
AMERICA WEST; WRITERS GUILD)	
OF AMERICA EAST,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
_____)	

Plaintiff has filed a Request for Appointment of Pro Bono Counsel ("Request"). Federal law allows district courts to appoint counsel in actions brought in forma pauperis. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Under section 1915(e)(1), appointment of counsel by the court is discretionary rather than mandatory. See United States v. \$292,888.04 in U.S. Currency, 54 F.3d 564, 569 (9th Cir. 1995). The district court may appoint counsel only in exceptional circumstances. See Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th

1 Cir. 1991). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires
2 evaluation of two factors: (1) the likelihood of success on the
3 merits; and (2) the ability of the litigant to articulate his
4 claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues
5 involved. See id.

6 As an initial matter, the court notes that it does not appear
7 that Plaintiff brought this action in forma pauperis. Nonetheless,
8 the court has evaluated both the likelihood of Plaintiff's success
9 on the merits and Plaintiff's ability to articulate her claims pro
10 se in light of the legal issues involved. Having done so, the
11 court does not find that the circumstances of this case are
12 sufficiently exceptional to justify granting the Request. The
13 court therefore DENIES Plaintiff's Request for Appointment of Pro
14 Bono Counsel.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17
18
19 Dated: November 15, 2012


20 DEAN D. PREGERSON
21 United States District Judge
22
23
24
25
26
27
28