DISTRICT COURT CT OF CALIFORNIA 1:14-cv-00093-SKO (PC)
CT OF CALIFORNIA
1:14-cv-00093-SKO (PC)
1:14-cv-00093-SKO (PC)
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
(Document #2)
filed a motion seeking the appointment of
right to appointed counsel in this action, <u>Rand v.</u>
and the court cannot require an attorney to
(e)(1). <u>Mallard v. United States District Court for</u>
8, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in
request the voluntary assistance of counsel
at 1525.
g and compensating counsel, the court will seek
exceptional cases. In determining whether
urt must evaluate both the likelihood of success of
ticulate his claims pro se in light of the
ternal quotation marks and citations omitted).

1	
1	In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances at this
2	stage in the proceedings. Once the court has screened plaintiff's complaint, the court will
3	reevaluate plaintiff's need for counsel if it determines the complaint states a viable claim for
4	relief. ¹ <u>Id.</u>
5	For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is HEREBY
6	DENIED, without prejudice.
7	
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	Dated: January 23, 2014 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	¹ Plaintiff's complaint will be screened in due course. 28 U.S.C. § 1915A.
	riantin s complaint win of servened in due course. 20 9.3.C. § 1713A.