

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

GABRIEL GOMEZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
C. GIPSON, et al.,
Defendants.

1:15-cv-00726-LJO-SKO (PC)
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
(Document# 6)

On June 1, 2015, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this federal civil rights 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),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

¹ Plaintiff’s motion was filed on a form motion requesting appointment of counsel in federal habeas corpus cases. However, this is not a habeas corpus proceeding and 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) does not apply

1 of 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. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a
7 determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a review of the record
8 in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. Id.

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: June 3, 2015

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28