1		
2		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JEROME WHITE,	1:11-cv-00047 AWI GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	v.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	PATEL, et al.,	(Document# 44)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On April 23, 2014, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff	
18	does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113	
19	F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to represent plaintiff	
20	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern	
21	District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in certain	
22	exceptional circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to	
23	section 1915(e)(1). <u>Rand</u> , 113 F.3d at 1525.	
24	Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court will seek	
25	volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether	
26	"exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success	
27	of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the	
28	complexity of the legal issues involved." <u>Id</u> .	(internal quotation marks and citations omitted). 1

1	In the present case, plaintiff argues that he is housed in an outpatient facility for mentally	
2	disturbed persons and has no reasonable way to obtain counsel. This does not make plaintiff's	
3	case exceptional. This court is faced with similar cases daily. While the court has found that	
4	plaintiff states cognizable claims for inadequate medical care under the Eighth Amendment, this	
5	finding is not a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits and at this juncture,	
6	the court cannot find that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. Plaintiff's medical claims do	
7	not appear complex, and based on a review of the record in this case, the court does not find that	
8	plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Thus, the court does not find the required	
9	exceptional circumstances, and plaintiff's motion shall be denied without prejudice to renewal of	
10	the motion at a later stage of the proceedings.	
11	For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is HEREBY	
12	DENIED, without prejudice.	
13		
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	Dated: April 24, 2014 /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	2	
	2	