

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 LONNIE CHARLES BROWN,

1:13-cv-00077-GSA (PC)

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

14 MATTHEW CATES, et al.,

(#9)

15 Defendants.
16 _____/

17 On March 11, 2013, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff
18 does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 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 Iowa, 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.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

1 In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. At this
2 early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to
3 succeed on the merits. Plaintiff filed the Complaint on January 16, 2013, and the Complaint awaits
4 the Court's screening required under 28 U.S.C. 1915. Thus, to date the Court has not found any
5 cognizable claims in Plaintiff's Complaint for which to initiate service of process, and no other
6 parties have yet appeared. Moreover, based on a review of the record in this case, the Court does
7 not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Therefore, Plaintiff's motion shall
8 be denied without prejudice to renewal of the motion at a later stage of the proceedings.

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

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 **Dated: March 14, 2013**

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE