1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 1:11-cv-00048 GSA (PC) RICHARD ABERCROMBIE, 12 Plaintiff. ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 v. (Document# 26) 14 DR. KAUT, et al., 15 Defendant(s). 16 On March 24, 2014, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff 17 does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 18 19 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 20 District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in certain 21 exceptional circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 22 section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525. 23 Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court will seek 24 volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether 25 "exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of 26 the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the 27

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

28

In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. At this stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. Plaintiff's sole defendant has not been served and, to date, has not been located after two attempts at service. While Plaintiff asserts that it is difficult for him to read, write and understand material regarding his case, based on the record in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims and respond to court orders. Further, the legal issue in this case – whether defendant failed to provide Plaintiff with adequate medical treatment – does not appear complex, and this court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Therefore, plaintiff's motion shall be denied without prejudice to renewal of the motion at a later stage of the proceedings.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 27, 2014 /s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE