

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  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIRON B. SPRINGFIELD,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
VISMAL J. SINGH, et al.,  
Defendants.

No. 2:12-cv-2552 KJM AC P

ORDER

Plaintiff’s current request for appointment of counsel, ECF No. 89, is unnecessary because the court granted such request, for limited purposes, by order filed October 7, 2015. Plaintiff’s additional reasons for requesting appointment of counsel will later be considered when assessing whether such appointment should extend beyond the currently identified limited purposes.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff’s request for appointment of counsel, ECF No. 89, is denied as unnecessary;
- and
- 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to send plaintiff, together with a copy of this order, a copy of the court’s order filed October 7, 2015 (ECF No. 88).

DATED: October 22, 2015

  
ALLISON CLAIRE  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE