

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

10 RAHN G. THOMPSON, 1:07-cv-01299 LJO GSA (PC)

11 Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

VS.

13 || STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

(DOCUMENT #20)

Defendants.

1

On April 16, 2009, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel.

17 Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v.

18 Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to
19 represent plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court
20 for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However,
21 in certain exceptional circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel
22 pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525.

In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Even if it is assumed that plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. This court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a review of the record in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. *Id.*

For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is
HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 23, 2009

/s/ Gary S. Austin

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE