

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ARMSTER HAMPTON,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:06-cv-0966 JAM KJN P

vs.

P. SAHOTA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____ /

On March 26, 2009, the Magistrate Judge issued an order denying plaintiff’s motion for counsel. On December 2, 2011, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of that order. Local Rule 303(b), states “rulings by Magistrate Judges shall be final if no reconsideration thereof is sought from the Court within fourteen days . . . from the date of service of the ruling on the parties. . .” E.D. Local Rule 303(b). Plaintiff’s request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge’s order of March 26, 2009, is therefore untimely.

To the extent plaintiff’s motion for reconsideration can be construed as a renewed motion for appointment of counsel, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in § 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional

