

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY RAGE FLANAGIN,

1:10-cv-00481 AWI-MJS (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

vs.

GEORGE GURBINO, et al.,

(ECF No. 12)

Defendants.

/

On July 29, 2010, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel [ECF No. 12].

Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the Court cannot require an attorney to represent plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525. However, without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether "exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims *pro se* in light

1 of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations  
2 omitted).

3 In the present case, the Court does not find the required exceptional circumstances.  
4 Even if it is assumed that Plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made  
5 serious allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional.  
6 This Court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the  
7 proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on  
8 the merits. Finally, based on a review of the record in this case, the Court does not find  
9 that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Id.

10 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff’s motion for the appointment of counsel [ECF  
11 No. 12] is DENIED.

12  
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: August 2, 2010

1st. Michael J. Seng  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28