

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

11 GREGORY ELL SHEHEE,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 RAUL FLORES, et al.,

15 Defendants.
16

1:14-cv-00589-LJO-GSA (PC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(Document# 15)

17 On January 26, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel.
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
27 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.
2 Plaintiff argues that counsel should be appointed because he suffers from impaired vision. This
3 alone does not make Plaintiff's case exceptional under the Ninth Circuit's standards discussed
4 above.

5 At this early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff
6 is likely to succeed on the merits. Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint was dismissed on
7 November 4, 2014, for failure to state a claim, with leave to amend. To date, Plaintiff has not
8 filed a Second Amended Complaint. Thus, there is no complaint on record in this case for which
9 the Court has found cognizable claims. Moreover, based on the court's record, the court does not
10 find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims or respond to the court's orders.
11 Plaintiff is advised that he is not precluded from renewing the motion for appointment of counsel
12 at a later stage of the proceedings.

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

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 Dated: January 29, 2015

/s/ Gary S. Austin
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE