1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 FRESNO DIVISION 10 11 12 13 DORIAN DAVIS aka Civil No. 08-1197 JTM (JMA) WALI AL-TAOI. 14 CDCR #K-78041, Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S 15 MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL 16 VS. [Doc. No. 12] 17 E.G. FLORES; J. CASTRO; T. BILLINGS; A. HEDGPETH; 18 R. MARTA, 19 Defendants. 20 21 I. 22 PROCEDURAL HISTORY 23 On August 15, 2008, Plaintiff, an inmate currently incarcerated at Kern Valley State Prison 24 located in Delano, California and proceeding pro se, filed a civil rights Complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 25 § 1983. Plaintiff has not prepaid the \$350 filing fee mandated by 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a) to commence a 26 civil action; instead, he filed a Motion to Proceed In Forma Pauperis ("IFP") pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 27 § 1915(a) [Doc. No. 2]. 28 ///

-1-

08cv1197

The Court granted Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *IFP* on August 21, 2008 [Doc. No. 4]. On November 26, 2008, this matter was reassigned to District Judge Jeffrey Miller for all further proceedings [Doc. No. 8]. The Court conducted a sua sponte screening of Plaintiff's Complaint and directed the United States Marshal to effect service of Plaintiff's Complaint on December 29, 2008. Plaintiff filed a "Motion to Appoint Counsel" on February 2, 2009 [Doc. No. 12].

II.

MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

"There is no constitutional right to appointed counsel in a § 1983 action." *Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997) (citing *Storseth v. Spellman*, 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981)); *see also Hedges v. Resolution Trust Corp. (In re Hedges)*, 32 F.3d 1360, 1363 (9th Cir. 1994) ("[T]here is no absolute right to counsel in civil proceedings.") (citation omitted). Thus, federal courts do not have the authority "to make coercive appointments of counsel." *Mallard v. United States District Court*, 490 U.S. 296, 310 (1989); *see also United States v. \$292,888.04 in U.S. Currency*, 54 F.3d 564, 569 (9th Cir. 1995).

Districts courts have discretion, however, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), to "request" that an attorney represent indigent civil litigants upon a showing of "exceptional circumstances." *See Agyeman v. Corrections Corp. of America*, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004); *Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525. "A finding of the exceptional circumstances of the plaintiff seeking assistance requires at least an evaluation of the likelihood of the plaintiff's success on the merits and an evaluation of the plaintiff's ability to articulate his claims 'in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." *Agyeman*, 390 F.3d at 1103 (quoting *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986)); *see also Terrell v. Brewer*, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991).

The Court agrees that any pro se litigant "would be better served with the assistance of counsel." *Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525 (citing *Wilborn*, 789 F.2d at 1331). However, so long as a pro se litigant, like Plaintiff in this case, is able to "articulate his claims against the relative complexity of the matter," the "exceptional circumstances" which might *require* the appointment of counsel do not exist. *Id.* (finding no abuse of discretion under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) when district court denied appointment of counsel despite fact that pro se prisoner "may well have fared better-particularly in the realms of discovery and

1	the securing of expert testimony."). The Court finds that neither the interests of justice nor
2	exceptional circumstances warrant appointment of counsel at this time. <i>LaMere v. Risley</i> , 827 F.2d 622,
3	626 (9th Cir. 1987); Terrell, 935 F.2d at 1017. For these reasons, the Court finds Plaintiff's Motion for
4	Appointment of Counsel must be denied.
5	III.
6	Conclusion and Order
7	Good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
8	Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel [Doc. No. 12] is DENIED without prejudice.
9	
10	DATED: February 13, 2009
11	Hop. Jeffrey T. Miller
12	United States District Judge
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28