1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	FRANCIS W. DAVIS,	1:09-cv-01897-AWI-SKO (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
	VS.	(Doc. 37)
	T. VILLAGRANA,	
15	Defendant.	
16 17	/	
17 18	This action is in the discovery phase, and on November 2, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion	
18 19	seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to the	
20	appointment of counsel in this action. <u>Palmer v. Valdez</u> , 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009); Storseth v. Spellman, 654 F.2d 1340, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981). The Court may request the	
	Storseth v. Spellman, 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981). The Court may request the	
21 22	voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), but it will do so only if	
22	exceptional circumstances exist. <u>Palmer</u> , 560 F.3d at 970; <u>Wilborn v. Escalderon</u> , 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). In making this determination, the Court must evaluate the	
24 25	likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of Plaintiff to articulate his claims <i>pro se</i> in	
	light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. <u>Palmer</u> , 560 F.3d at 970 (citation and quatation marks amitted); Wilherm 780 F.2d at 1331. Noither consideration is dispositive and	
26 27	quotation marks omitted); <u>Wilborn</u> , 789 F.2d at 1331. Neither consideration is dispositive and	
	they must be viewed together. <u>Palmer</u> , 560 F.3d at 970 (citation and quotation marks omitted); Wilborn 789 F 2d at 1331	
28	<u>Wilborn</u> 789 F.2d at 1331.	

1	In the present case, the Court does not find the required exceptional circumstances.	
2	Even if it is assumed that Plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious	
3	allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. The Court	
4	is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this stage in the proceedings, the Court	
5	cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a	
6	review of the record in this case, the Court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately	
7	articulate his claims. <u>Id.</u>	
8	For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is HEREBY	
9	DENIED, without prejudice.	
10		
11	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
12	Dated: November 7, 2012 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto	
13	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	-2-	