| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | |
| 3 | |
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| 7 | |
| 8 | IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 10 | DEANGELO CLAY, |
| 11 | Plaintiff, No. CIV S-09-2899 CKD P |
| 12 | VS. |
| 13 | J. WALKER, et al., |
| 14 | Defendants. ORDER |
| 15 | / |
| 16 | Plaintiff has requested the appointment of counsel. The United States Supreme |
| 17 | Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent |
| 18 | prisoners in § 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In |
| 19 | certain exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel |
| 20 | pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); |
| 21 | Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). In the present case, the court |
| 22 | does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Plaintiff's request for the appointment of |
| 23 | counsel will therefore be denied. |
| 24 | Plaintiff has also requested that another inmate, acting as plaintiff's legal |
| 25 | assistant, be present at plaintiff's videotaped deposition. As plaintiff has no right to the presence |
| 26 | of an inmate legal assistant at his deposition, the court will deny this request. |
| | 1 |

| 1 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: |
|----|--|
| 2 | 1. Plaintiff's January 6, 2012 motion for legal assistant (Dkt. No. 56) is denied; |
| 3 | 2. Plaintiff's January 9, 2012 motion to appoint counsel (Dkt. No. 57) is denied. |
| 4 | Dated: January 24, 2012 |
| 5 | Carop U. Delany |
| 6 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 7 | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | 2 |
| 10 | clay2899.31 |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| | 2 |
| | |