н

I

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	JEFFREY E. WALKER,
11	Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-0642 WBS CKD P
12	VS.
13	A. H. WHITTEN, et al.,
14	Defendants. <u>ORDER</u>
15	/
16	Plaintiff has requested an extension of time to file an opposition to defendants'
17	motion for summary judgment. Good cause appearing, that request will be granted.
18	Plaintiff has also requested the appointment of counsel. The United States
19	Supreme Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent
20	indigent prisoners in § 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298
21	(1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of
22	counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). <u>Terrell v. Brewer</u> , 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir.
23	1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). In the present case, the
24	court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Plaintiff's request for the
25	appointment of counsel will therefore be denied.
26	
	1

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
2	1. Plaintiff's December 12, 2011 motion for an extension of time is granted;
3	2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file and
4	serve his opposition to defendants' motion for summary judgment.
5	3. Plaintiff's December 12, 2011 request for the appointment of counsel is
6	denied. <sup>1</sup>
7	Dated: December 15, 2011
8	Carop. U. Delany
9	CAROLYN K. DELANEY / UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	1/kly
14	walk0642.31
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff filed three documents on December 12, 2011 in which plaintiff makes representations which are confusing. It is possible, but not entirely clear, plaintiff is requesting an
25 26	extension of the August 26, 2011 discovery cutoff date to either propound more discovery requests or file a motion to compel responses to discovery. However, plaintiff has not provided the court with any coherent reason as to why the court should extend the deadline for discovery.