

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

DANNY MURPHY COSTON,

Plaintiff,

No. 2:10-cv-2009 MCE EFB P

vs.

ANDREW NANGALAMA, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

_____/


Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding without counsel in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. On April 10, 2013, plaintiff filed a document in which he states that he does not have an attorney and requests that he be enrolled in the court’s pro bono program. The court construes plaintiff’s request as a request for appointment of counsel.

District courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in section 1983 cases. *Mallard v. United States Dist. Court*, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In exceptional circumstances, the court may request an attorney to voluntarily to represent such a plaintiff. *See* 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). When determining whether “exceptional circumstances” exist, the court must consider the likelihood of success on the merits as well as the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in light of the

1 complexity of the legal issues involved. *Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009).
2 Having considered those factors, the court finds there are no exceptional circumstances in this
3 case.

4 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for appointment of
5 counsel, Dckt. No. 75, is denied.

6 DATED: April 15, 2013.

7 
8 EDMUND F. BRENNAN
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26