

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**

RANDY STOOPS,

No. 2:15-CV-2581-MCE-CMK-P

Plaintiff,

vs.

ORDER

JOSEPH M. BEASLEY, et al.,

Defendants.

_____ /

Plaintiff, a prisoner proceeding pro se, brings this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

Plaintiff seeks the 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. See Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In certain exceptional circumstances, the court may request the voluntary assistance of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). See Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). A finding of “exceptional circumstances” requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims on his own in light of the complexity of the legal

1 issues involved. See Terrell, 935 F.2d at 1017. Neither factor is dispositive and both must be
2 viewed together before reaching a decision. See id.

3 In the present case, the court does not at this time find the required exceptional
4 circumstances. First, plaintiff's filings demonstrate that he has an ability to articulate himself
5 and his claims. Second, while the court has determined that plaintiff's complaint appears to state
6 cognizable claims, the court cannot say at this early stage of the proceedings – before any
7 defendant has even been served – that plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits. Finally,
8 plaintiff's claims are not complex.

9 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's request for the
10 appointment of counsel (Doc. 10) is denied.

11
12 DATED: June 30, 2016

13 
14 **CRAIG M. KELLISON**
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26