1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOSEPH A. BROWN,	1:12-cv-00165-AWI-GSA (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	v.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, et al.,	(Document# 46)
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On December 12, 2013, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsels	
18	Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland,	
19	113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to represent	
20	plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the	
21	Southern 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). Rand, 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 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 citations omitted).

In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. At this early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. Plaintiff filed the Fourth Amended Complaint on December 12, September 20, 2012, approximately a week ago, and the Fourth Amended Complaint awaits the court's screening required by 28 U.S.C. 1915A. Thus, to date the court has not found any cognizable claims in Plaintiff's complaint for which to initiate service of process, and no other parties have yet appeared. Plaintiff's claims – for retaliation, conspiracy, violations of due process, excessive force, and inadequate medical care – are not complex, and based on the record in this case, the court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. 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: December 19, 2013 /s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE