1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	FRANK LEE DEARWESTER,	No. 2:13-cv-2064 MCE DAD P
12	Plaintiff,	
13	v.	<u>ORDER</u>
14	SACRAMENTO COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,	
15	Defendant.	
16	Defendant.	
17		
18	Plaintiff has requested a second extension of time to file an opposition to defendant's	
19	October 7, 2014 motion to dismiss. Good cause appearing, the court will grant plaintiff's request.	
20	Plaintiff has also filed a motion for appointment of counsel. The United States Supreme	
21	Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners	
22	in § 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain	
23	exceptional circumstances, the district court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel	
24	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). <u>Terrell v. Brewer</u> , 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991);	
25	Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990).	
26	The test for exceptional circumstances requires the court to evaluate the plaintiff's	
27	likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in	

light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. See Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328,

28

1331 (9th Cir. 1986); Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). Circumstances common to most prisoners, such as lack of legal education and limited law library access, do not establish exceptional circumstances that would warrant a request for voluntary assistance of counsel. In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (Doc. No. 24) is granted; 2. Plaintiff is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order in which to file an opposition to defendant's motion to dismiss. Defendant shall file any reply in accordance with Local Rule 230(1); and 3. Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 25) is denied. Dated: January 6, 2015 DAD:9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE dear2064.36opp(2)