

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LEONARD FARLEY,
Plaintiff,

1:06-cv-01760-LJO-MJS (PC)

vs.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

E. CAPOT, et al.,
Defendants.

(ECF No. 52)

_____ /

On September 20, 2010, Plaintiff Leonard Farley filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel.

Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the Court cannot require an attorney to represent plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989).

In certain exceptional circumstances the Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525. However, without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether "exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims *pro se* in light

1 of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations
2 omitted).

3 In the present case, the Court does not find the required exceptional circumstances.
4 Even if it is assumed that Plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made
5 serious allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional.
6 This Court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the
7 proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on
8 the merits. Finally, based on a review of the record in this case, the Court does not find
9 that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Id. In fact, Plaintiff has already
10 successfully appealed dismissal of this action thus indicating his effectiveness as an
11 advocate.

12 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s motion for the appointment of counsel is
13 DENIED, without prejudice.

14
15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: September 22, 2010

/s/ Michael J. Seng
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28