

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

MARIO MOLINA,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
K. HOLLAND, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:15-cv-01260-DAD-EPG (PC)  
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION  
FOR APPOINTMENT OF PRO BONO  
COUNSEL  
(ECF NO. 63)

Mario Molina (“Plaintiff”) is a state prisoner proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* with this civil rights action filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On September 5, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion for appointment of pro bono counsel. (ECF No. 63).

This is Plaintiff’s second motion for appointment of pro bono counsel in less than three months. While Plaintiff was advised that he could renew the motion, he was also advised that it was to be at a “later stage of the proceedings.” (ECF No. 58, p. 2). It appears that nothing has changed since Plaintiff filed a motion for appointment of pro bono counsel (there was, and still is, an upcoming evidentiary hearing on the issue of exhaustion). Accordingly, for the reasons laid out in the Court’s prior order (*id.*), Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of pro bono counsel will be denied.

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

Plaintiff is advised that he is not precluded from renewing the motion for appointment of pro bono counsel at a later stage of the proceedings.

For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for appointment of pro bono counsel is DENIED without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 7, 2017

/s/ Eric P. Gray  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE