I

I

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	IVAN RAY CARTER, JR.,	1:08-cv-01841-AWI-DLB (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	VS.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	A. FERNANDEZ, et al,	(#41)
15	Defendants.	
16	/	
17	On February 22, 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 will seek	
25	volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether	
26	"exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success	
27	of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the	
28	complexity of the legal issues involved." <u>Id.</u> (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).	

-1-

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