28

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 No. 2:23-cv-0903 KJM SCR P DURRELL ANTHONY PUCKETT, 12 Plaintiff. 13 v. **ORDER** 14 JEFF LYNCH, 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 under 28 U.S.C. 19 §1915 to require counsel to represent indigent prisoners in section 1983 cases. Mallard v. United 20 States Dist. Court, 490 U.S. 296, 298 (1989). In exceptional circumstances, the court may request 21 an attorney to voluntarily represent such a plaintiff. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); Terrell v. 22 Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991); Wood v. Housewright, 900 F.2d 1332, 1335-36 (9th Cir. 1990). When determining whether "exceptional circumstances" exist, the court must 23 24 consider plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits as well as the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Palmer v. 25 26 Valdez, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009) (district court did not abuse discretion in declining to 27 appoint counsel). The burden of demonstrating exceptional circumstances is on the plaintiff. Id.

Circumstances common to most prisoners, such as lack of legal education and limited law library

access, do not establish exceptional circumstances that warrant a request for voluntary assistance of counsel.

Having considered the factors under <u>Palmer</u>, the court finds that plaintiff has failed to meet his burden of demonstrating exceptional circumstances warranting the appointment of counsel at this time.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's requests for the appointment of counsel (ECF Nos. 35, 38) are denied without prejudice.

Dated: November 22, 2024

SEAN C. RIORDAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE