1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 NICK WOODALL, 1:08-cv-01948 OWW DLB (PC) 12 Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 VS. STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al., 14 (#66)15 Defendants. 16 17 On December 6, 2010, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. 18 Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. 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 (1989). However, in certain exceptional 22 circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 23 1915(e)(1). Rand, 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." *Id.* (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

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. 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: March 14, 2011 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE