| 1 | | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | LEONICIO DEJESUS, | No. 2:16-cv-2375 KJM CKD |
| 12 | Plaintiff, | |
| 13 | V. | ORDER |
| 14 | MICHAEL MARTEL, et al, | |
| 15 | Defendants. | |
| 16 | - | |
| 17 | Plaintiff is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in an action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. | |
| 18 | Plaintiff requests that the court appoint counsel. District courts lack authority to require counsel | |
| 19 | to represent indigent prisoners in section 1983 cases. Mallard v. United States Dist. Court, 490 | |
| 20 | U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In exceptional circumstances, the court may request an attorney to | |
| 21 | voluntarily represent such a plaintiff. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d | |
| 22 | 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). | |
| 23 | When determining whether "exceptional circumstances" exist, the court must consider plaintiff's | |
| 24 | likelihood of success on the merits as well as the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims pro | |
| 25 | se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Palmer v. Valdez, 560 F.3d 965, 970 | |
| 26 | (9th Cir. 2009) (district court did not abuse discretion in declining to appoint counsel). The | |
| 27 | burden of demonstrating exceptional circumstances is on the plaintiff. Id. Circumstances | |
| 28 | common to most prisoners, such as lack of le | gal education and limited law library access, do not |
| | | 1 |

| 1 | establish exceptional circumstances that warrant a request for voluntary assistance of counsel. | |
|----|---|--|
| 2 | Having considered the factors under Palmer, the court finds that plaintiff has failed to | |
| 3 | meet his burden of demonstrating exceptional circumstances warranting the appointment of | |
| 4 | counsel at this time. | |
| 5 | Additionally, Plaintiff has filed a motion for extension of time to file a second amended | |
| 6 | complaint. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: | |
| 7 | 1. Plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel (ECF No. 16) is denied without | |
| 8 | prejudice; | |
| 9 | 2. Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 16) is granted; and | |
| 10 | 3. Plaintiff is granted one hundred and twenty days from the date of this order in which to | |
| 11 | file a second amended complaint. | |
| 12 | Dated: July 11, 2017 Carop U. Delany | |
| 13 | CAROLYN K. DELANEY | |
| 14 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | deje2375.31new+36.docx | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| 26 | | |
| 27 | | |
| 28 | | |
| | 2 | |