

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

ANTWONE DORNELL GOOLSBY, Sr.,
Plaintiff,
v.
JENKINS,
Defendant.

No. 2:15-cv-1919 MCE CKD P (TEMP)

ORDER

Plaintiff, a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a civil rights action, has requested appointment of counsel.


The United States Supreme Court has ruled that district courts lack authority to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in § 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the district court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 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).

The test for exceptional circumstances requires the court to evaluate the plaintiff's 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, 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

1 establish exceptional circumstances that would warrant a request for voluntary assistance of
2 counsel. In the present case, the court does not find the required exceptional circumstances.

3 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's July 14, 2016 motion for the
4 appointment of counsel (ECF No. 40) is denied.

5 Dated: July 27, 2016



6 CAROLYN K. DELANEY
7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8
9
10 DAD:
/md; gool1919.31.dad

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28