1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11		
12	DOUGAL SAMUELS,	Case No. 1:10-cv-00585-DAD-EPG (PC)
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF PRO BONO COUNSEL WITHOUT PREJUDICE
14	V.	(ECF NO. 111)
15	PAM AHLIN, et al., Defendants.	
16	Derendants.	
17 18		
18 19	Dougal Samuels ("Plaintiff") is a civ	il detainee proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis
19 20		
	with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.	
21 22	On November 2, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion for appointment of pro bono counsel.	
22 23	(ECF No. 111). Plaintiff asks for appointment of counsel because he is unable to afford counsel;	
23 24	because the issues involved in this case are complex; because there will be conflicting testimony;	
24 25	because both sides will need to present expert witnesses; because Plaintiff will require	
25 26	considerable discovery; because Plaintiff is not well versed in litigation and has no real legal	
26 27	training; because Plaintiff has "a basic low I.Q."; because Plaintiff's pleadings and motions in this	
27 28	case, as well as the arguments he has presented, have been prepared by a jailhouse lawyer who will likely soon be released; because Plaintiff has medical problems; because Plaintiff is confined	
28	win inkery soon of released, because ridilitii	1

in a mental institution and has no ability to conduct an investigation of the facts; and because
 Plaintiff's claims have been determined to be valid.

Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, <u>Rand v.</u>
<u>Rowland</u>, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), <u>withdrawn in part on other grounds</u>, 154 F.3d 952
(9th Cir. 1998), and the Court cannot require an attorney to represent Plaintiff pursuant to 28
U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). <u>Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa</u>,
490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in certain exceptional circumstances
the Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). <u>Rand</u>,
113 F.3d at 1525.

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, a 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 of the
complexity of the legal issues involved." <u>Id.</u> (internal quotation marks and citation omitted).

The Court will not order appointment of pro bono counsel at this time. The Court has
reviewed the record in this case, and at this time the Court is unable to make a determination that
Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits of his claims. Moreover, while Plaintiff has claimed it
is with the assistance of a jailhouse lawyer, it appears that Plaintiff can adequately articulate his
claims.

Plaintiff is advised that he is not precluded from renewing his motion for appointment of
pro bono counsel at a later stage of the proceedings.

For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for appointment of pro
 bono counsel is DENIED without prejudice.
 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25	Dated: November 5, 2018	Is/ Encir P. Grog- UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26		
27		
28		
		2

24