

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

ISAIAH JOEL PETILLO,
Plaintiff,
v.
J.L. PETERSON,
Defendant.

1:16-cv-00488-AWI-MJS (PC)

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

(ECF No. 51)

Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

On April 09, 2018, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 51.)

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 (1989). 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. However, without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the Court will seek volunteer counsel

1 only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether exceptional
2 circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of the
3 merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the
4 complexity of the legal issues involved. Id. (internal quotation marks and citations
5 omitted).

6 In the present case, the Court does not find the required exceptional
7 circumstances. Even if it is assumed that Plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that
8 he has made serious allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is
9 not exceptional. This Court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early
10 stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to
11 succeed on the merits. And, based on a review of the record in this case, even though
12 the issues are complex, the court does not find that Plaintiff cannot adequately articulate
13 his claims. Id.

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

16 IT IS SO ORDERED.

17
18 Dated: April 10, 2018

1st Michael J. Seng
19 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28