| 1  |  |                            |
|----|--|----------------------------|
| 2  |  |                            |
| 3  |  |                            |
| 4  |  |                            |
| 5  |  |                            |
| 6  |  |                            |
| 7  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                            |
| 8  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                            |
| 9  |  |                            |
| 10 | CARLOS J. GARCIA,  | No. 2:15-cv-1888 MCE CKD P |
| 11 | Plaintiff,   |                            |
| 12 | V.   | <u>ORDER</u>               |
| 13 | BONNIE LEE, et al.,  |                            |
| 14 | Defendants.  |                            |
| 15 |  |                            |
| 16 | Plaintiff has requested the appointment of counsel. The United States Supreme Court has                |                            |
| 17 | ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in § 1983 |                            |
| 18 | cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional          |                            |
| 19 | circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §       |                            |
| 20 | 1915(e)(1). Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900           |                            |
| 21 | F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). In the present case, the court does not find the required          |                            |
| 22 | exceptional circumstances. Plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel will therefore be        |                            |
| 23 | denied.  |                            |
| 24 | ////   |                            |
| 25 | ////   |                            |
| 26 | ////   |                            |
| 27 | ////   |                            |
| 28 | ////   |                            |
|    |  | 1                          |

Plaintiff has also filed a motion stating that, due to a lockdown, he is unable to comply with certain Local Rules. (ECF No. 11.) As it is not clear what relief he is seeking, this motion will be denied. However, plaintiff's First Amended Complaint (ECF No. 13) will be accepted for screening by the court.

## Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion for leave to comply with local rules (ECF No. 11) is denied; and
- 2. Plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 12) is denied.

Dated: November 10, 2015

CAROLYN K. DELANEY

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

2/kly

garc1888.31(2)