

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

GUSTAVO TORRES,
Plaintiff,
v.
CAPTAIN WADDEL, et al.,
Defendants.

1:14-cv-01217-BAM (PC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(ECF No. 3)

Plaintiff Gustavo Torres (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff filed his complaint on August 4, 2014. Plaintiff also filed the instant motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 3.)

Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to represent plaintiff pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296, 298, 109 S.Ct. 1814, 1816 (1989). However, in certain exceptional circumstances the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113 F.3d at 1525.

Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court will seek volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether “exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success on

1 the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the
2 complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

3 In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Even
4 if it is assumed that plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious allegations
5 which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. This court is faced with
6 similar cases almost daily from indigent prisoners. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings,
7 the court cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based
8 on a review of the record in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately
9 articulate his claims. Id.

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

12
13 IT IS SO ORDERED.

14 Dated: August 13, 2014

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28