1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	LON CARTER,	1:07-cv-01325-OWW-YNP_GSA-(PC)	
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
13	vs.		
14	NICK DAWSON, WARDEN, et al.,	( #34)	
15	Defendants.	( <i>π</i> <b>5-</b> )	
16	/		
17	On February 11, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel.		
18	Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, <u>Rand v.</u>		
19	Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to		
20	represent plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court		
21	for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in		
22	certain exceptional circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel		
23	pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). <u>Rand</u> , 113 F.3d at 1525.		
24	Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court		
25	will seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining		
26	whether "exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of		
27	success of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of		
28	the complexity of the legal issues involved." <u>Id</u> .	(internal quotation marks and citations omitted).	

1	In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances.	
2	Even if it is assumed that plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious	
3	allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. This court is	
4	faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the court	
5	cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a	
6	review of the record in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately articulate	
7	his claims. <u>Id</u> .	
8	For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is	
9	HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice.	
10	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
11	Dated: <u>February 18, 2010</u> /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
12	UNITED STATES WAOISTRATE JODGE	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	-2-	