1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
8	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
9			
10	DOUGLAS L. HOPPER,	CASE: 1:10-cv-00055-GBC (PC)	
11	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR	
12	v.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
13	S. WRIGHT, et al.,	Doc. 18	
14	Defendants.	/	
15		!	
16	On May 4, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff does		
17	not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520,		
18	1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the Court cannot require an attorney to represent Plaintiff pursuant to 28		
19	U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490		
20	U.S. 296, 298 (1989). However, in certain exceptional circumstances the Court may request the		
21	voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to § 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525.		
22	Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will seek		
23	volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether		
24	"exceptional circumstances exist, the District	Court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of	
25	the merits [and] the ability of the [Plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity		
26	of the legal issues involved." <i>Id</i> .		
27	In the present case, the Court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Even if		
28	it is assumed that Plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious allegations		
	Page 1 of 2		

(PC) Hopper v. Wright et al

Doc. 20

1	which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. This Court is faced with
2	similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot make a
3	determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a review of the record
4	in this case, the Court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. <i>Id</i> .
5	For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is HEREBY
6	DENIED, without prejudice.
7	IT IS SO ORDERED.
8	Dated: May 9, 2012
9	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
<ul><li>20</li><li>21</li></ul>	
21	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
 28	