1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DI	STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10		
11	CARL JOHNSON,	Case No. 1:18-cv-00061-DAD-JDP
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL
13	V.	ECF No. 25
14 15	J. SCALIA, A. FRITZ, B. HACKWORTH, J. CAMPOS, A. ARANDA, and DOES 1-4,	ORDER DENYING MOTION TO COMPEL DISCOVERY
16	Defendants.	ECF No. 26
17		ORDER DIRECTING RESPONSE TO SETTLEMENT REQUEST
18		THIRTY-DAY DEADLINE
19		
20	Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in this civil rights action brought	
21	under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Pending before the court are plaintiff's motions to appoint counsel, ECF	
22	No. 25, to compel discovery, ECF No. 26, and to refer the case for settlement, ECF No. 28. We	
23	address each in turn below.	
24	I. Appointment of Counsel	
25	Plaintiff does not have a constitutional right to appointed counsel in this action, see Rand	
26	v. Rowland, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), withdrawn in part on other grounds on reh'g en	

represent plaintiff. See Mallard v. U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Iowa, 490 U.S.

banc, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998), and the court lacks the authority to require an attorney to

27

28

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).

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, at this early stage in the proceedings, 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.

II. Discovery Dispute

On March 28, 2019, plaintiff moved to compel certain discovery, alleging that defendants had not produced documents or responded to requests for admissions that plaintiff served on January 17, 2019. *See* ECF No. 26. On April 24, 2019, defendants responded that such discovery had been produced. *See* ECF No. 27. Plaintiff did not reply. Thus, plaintiff's motion is denied as moot. Should further discovery disputes arise, the parties must attempt to resolve them informally before filing motions with the court. *See* Local Rule 251.

III. Settlement

Plaintiff moves the court for a settlement conference. ECF No. 28. Defendants have not responded to this motion. The parties should discuss whether settlement in this case may be feasible. After such discussion, defendants are to respond to plaintiff's motion and indicate whether they believe a settlement conference could be productive. Defendants' response to plaintiff's motion is due in thirty days.

1	IV.	Order
2	Accordingly,	
3		1. Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel is denied without prejudice. ECF No. 25.
4		2. Plaintiff's motion to compel certain discovery is denied as moot. ECF No. 26.
5		3. Defendants are directed to respond to plaintiff's settlement request, ECF No 28,
6		thirty days from the date of this order.
7	TT 1 0 00	
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
9	Dated:	August 6, 2019
10		
11		
12		
13	No. 204	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
2728		
20		