I

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	ROBERTO HERRERA,1:12-cv-01915 GSA (PC)	
12	Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR	
13	vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
14	H. NGUYEN, (MOTION #10)	
15	Defendant.	
16	/	
17	On April 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	
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, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances, and
2	Plaintiff's motion shall be denied. At this early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make
3	a determination that Plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. Plaintiff's Complaint was
4	dismissed on April 3, 2013, for failure to state a claim, with leave to amend. To date, Plaintiff
5	has not filed an amended complaint. Thus, there is no complaint on record in this case for
6	which the Court has found cognizable claims. It is too early for service of process, and no other
7	parties have yet appeared. Moreover, the Court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately
8	articulate his claims or respond to the Court's orders. Plaintiff is advised that he is not
9	precluded from renewing the motion for appointment of counsel at a later stage of the
10	proceedings.
11	For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is
12	HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice.
13	IT IS SO ORDERED.
14	Dated: <u>May 2, 2013</u> /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25 26	
20 27	
27	
20	
	-2-