П

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	ANTHONY JONES, No. 2:10-CV-0033-MCE-CMK-P
12	Plaintiff,
13	vs. <u>ORDER</u>
14	E. McATEE, et al.,
15	Defendants.
16	/
17	Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to
18	42 U.S.C. § 1983.
19	Plaintiff seeks the appointment of counsel. The United States Supreme Court has
20	ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in
21	§ 1983 cases. See Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain
22	exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to
23	28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). See Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v.
24	Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). A finding of "exceptional
25	circumstances" requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the
26	ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims on his own in light of the complexity of the legal

1

issues involved. <u>See Terrell</u>, 935 F.2d at 1017. Neither factor is dispositive and both must be
 viewed together before reaching a decision. <u>See id.</u>

In the present case, the court does not at this time find the required exceptional circumstances. First, a review of the docket reflects that plaintiff has been able to articulate his claims and litigate this action on his own. Second, the issues raised are neither factually nor legally complex. Finally, the court cannot say at this stage of the proceeding whether plaintiff is likely or not to succeed on the merits. Given these considerations, the court cannot say at this time that exceptional circumstances exist warranting the appointment of counsel.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for the
10 appointment of counsel (Doc. 122) is denied.

DATED: February 6, 2015

**CRAIG M. KELLISON** UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE