

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  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL D. HARRISON,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
D. ADAMS, et al.,  
Defendant.

1:08-cv-01065 AWI MJS (PC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL  
(ECF No. 172)

Plaintiff Michael D. Harrison (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On November 25, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 172.)

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 (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

1 both the likelihood of success of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate  
2 his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal  
3 quotation marks and citations omitted).

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

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

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: November 27, 2013

1st Michael J. Seng  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28