I

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8	
9	JIMMY MCDONALD, CASE NO. 1:09-cv-00730-LJO-SKO PC
10	Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
11	v. (Doc. 111)
12	J. A. YATES, et al.,
13	Defendants.
14	·
15	Plaintiff Jimmy McDonald is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this
16	civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On February 7, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion
17	seeking the appointment of counsel.
18	Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to the appointment of counsel in this action.
19	Palmer v. Valdez, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009); Storseth v. Spellman, 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th
20	Cir. 1981). The Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §
21	1915(e)(1), but it will do so only if exceptional circumstances exist. Palmer, 560 F.3d at 970;
22	Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1981). In making this determination, the
23	Court must evaluate the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of Plaintiff to articulate
24	his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Palmer, 560 F.3d at 970
25	(citation and quotation marks omitted); Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331. Neither consideration is
26	dispositive and they must be viewed together. Palmer, 560 F.3d at 970 (citation and quotation marks
27	omitted); <u>Wilborn</u> 789 F.2d at 1331.
28	///

1

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. The Court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a review of the record in this case, the Court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Id. Plaintiff was able to successfully oppose Defendants' motion for summary judgment and at trial, the issues will largely be determined by the credibility of the parties' testimony. For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: February 20, 2013

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE