

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MICHANN MEADOWS,

1:11-cv-00257-SMS (PC)

Plaintiff,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AS MOOT

vs.

DR. REEVES, et al.,

(Doc. 20)

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

On June 11, 2012, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. 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). However, 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.

Counsel for Plaintiff has already been appointed in the present case for the limited purpose of drafting and filing an amended complaint. (Doc. 19.) The only action pending in this case is the filing of an amended complaint on Plaintiff’s behalf such that her motion for appointment of counsel at this time is moot.<sup>1</sup>

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff’s motion for the appointment of counsel, filed on June 11, 2012 (Doc. 20), is DENIED as moot.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**Dated: July 10, 2012**

**/s/ Sandra M. Snyder**

\_\_\_\_\_

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent to the filing of an amended complaint, counsel may remain on the case if she and her office desire to do so.

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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