

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
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TONY ASBERRY,
Plaintiff,
v.
C. RELEVANTE, *et al.*,
Defendants.

Case No. 1:16-cv-01741-LJO-JDP
ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF’S MOTION
TO APPOINT COUNSEL
ECF No. 172

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, moves for counsel for the third time in this case. ECF No. 172. Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, *see Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court lacks the authority to require an attorney to represent plaintiff. *See Mallard v. U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). The court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) (“The court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel”); *Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525. However, without a means to compensate counsel, the court will seek volunteer counsel only in exceptional circumstances. In determining whether such circumstances exist, “the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success on the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” *Rand*, 113 F.3d at 1525 (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

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

The court cannot conclude that exceptional circumstances requiring the appointment of counsel are present here. The allegations in the complaint are not exceptionally complicated. Based on a review of the record, it is not apparent that plaintiff is unable to articulate his claims adequately. Further, plaintiff has not demonstrated that he is likely to succeed on the merits.

The court may revisit this issue at a later stage of the proceedings if the interests of justice so require. If plaintiff later renews his request for counsel, he should provide a detailed explanation of the circumstances that he believes justify appointment of counsel.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 14, 2020


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

No. 204.