1		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	LINUTED CTAT	SEC DICTRICT COLIDT
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		1 17 00524 H.T. (DC)
11	MALIK MOORE-BEY,	1:17-cv-00534-JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
13	v.	(Doc. 3)
14	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	
15	Defendant.	
16		
17	On April 17, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion seeking the appointment of counsel. Plaintiff	
18	does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, Rand v. Rowland, 113	
19	F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), and the court cannot require an attorney to represent plaintiff	
20	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Mallard v. United States District Court for the Southern	
21	<u>District of Iowa</u> , 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). However, in certain exceptional circumstances the	
22	court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to section 1915(e)(1). Rand, 113	
23	F.3d at 1525.	
24	Without a reasonable method of securing and compensating counsel, the court will seek	
25	volunteer counsel only in the most serious and exceptional cases. In determining whether	
26	"exceptional circumstances exist, the district court must evaluate both the likelihood of success of	
27	the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro se in light of the	
28	complexity of the legal issues involved." <u>Id</u> . (internal quotation marks and citations omitted).	

In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Even if it is assumed that plaintiff is not well versed in the law and that he has made serious allegations which, if proved, would entitle him to relief, his case is not exceptional. This court is faced with similar cases almost daily. Further, at this early stage in the proceedings, the court cannot make a determination that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits, and based on a review of the record in this case, the court does not find that plaintiff cannot adequately articulate his claims. <u>Id</u>.

For the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED, without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 24, 2017 /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE