

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

TED BLACKMON,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.  
M. JUNIOUS, et al.,  
Defendants.

1:16-cv-01773-DAD-GSA-PC  
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL  
(ECF No. 16.)

On September 18, 2017, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. 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). 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 of the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” Id. (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).

1 Here, the Court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. At this early  
2 stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot make a determination that Plaintiff is likely to  
3 succeed on the merits. Plaintiff's Complaint was dismissed on August 28, 2017, for failure to  
4 state a claim, with leave to amend. To date, Plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint.  
5 Thus, there is no complaint on record in this case for which the Court has found cognizable  
6 claims. It is too early for service of process, and no other parties have yet appeared. Moreover,  
7 based on the record for this case, the Court finds that Plaintiff can adequately articulate his  
8 claims. Plaintiff is advised that he is not precluded from renewing the motion for appointment  
9 of counsel at a later stage of the proceedings. Therefore, the motion for reconsideration shall be  
10 denied.

11 Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of  
12 counsel is HEREBY DENIED, without prejudice.

13  
14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 Dated: October 18, 2017

/s/ Gary S. Austin  
16 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28