(PC) Davy v. Swanson			
1			
2			
3			
4			
5	5		
6	6		
7	7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE		
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11	1 PIERRE DAVY, 1:12-cv-00749-GSA (PC)		
12		ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
13			
14	A. SWANSON, (Document #28)		
15			
16			
17	On August 22, 2013, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff		
18	does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, <u>Rand v. Rowland</u> , 113 F.3d		
19	1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to represent plaintiff pursuant		
20	to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of		
21	<u>Iowa</u> , 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in certain exceptional		
22	circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section		
23	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		
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).		

Doc. 31

In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Plaintiff seeks appointment of counsel because he lacks adequate access to the law library, which is not an exceptional circumstance. A review of the record in this case shows that plaintiff is responsive, adequately communicates, and is able to articulate his claims. Moreover, the legal issue in this case, whether defendant used excessive force against plaintiff, is not complex, and this court is faced with similar cases almost daily.

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

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2013 /s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE