1	
2	
3	
4	
5 6	
0 7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	ANTHONY MILES, 1:10-cv-02055-MJS (PC)
12	Plaintiff,
13	v. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	JAMES YATES, et al.,
15	(ECF No. 3) Defendants.
16	/
17	On November 5, 2010, Plaintiff Anthony Miles filed a motion seeking the
18	appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 3.) Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to
19	appointed counsel in this action, <u>Rand v. Rowland</u> , 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997),
20	and, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), the Court cannot require an attorney to represent
21	Plaintiff. Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S.
22	296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, however the
23	Court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel. <u>Rand</u> , 113 F.3d at 1525.
24	Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will
25	seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining
26	whether "exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the
27	likelihood of success of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims
28	<i>pro se</i> in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." <u>Id.</u> (internal quotation marks
	-1-

and citations omitted).

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. This Court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. Finally, based on a review of the record in this case, the Court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Id.

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

<u>isi Michael J. Seng</u> D STATES MAGISTRATE J Dated: November 9, 2010 UNITED S

JUDGE