

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ALEJANDRO REYES CRUZ,
Plaintiff,
v.
VICTOR VILLARNEAL, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [23-cv-00962-CRB](#)

**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO
APPOINT COUNSEL**

Pro se plaintiff Alejandro Reyes Cruz (“Cruz”) has filed two motions to appoint counsel in this action. See dkt. 8, 26. Pursuant to General Order No. 25,¹ the Court concludes that Cruz has not met the eligibility requirements for appointment of pro bono counsel.

First, Cruz has not demonstrated to the Court that he lacks financial resources to retain counsel, either in his motions to appoint counsel nor in his motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, which Judge Westmore denied. See dkt. 2, 7, 10, 11. Second, the Court is not convinced that Cruz used reasonable efforts to retain private counsel. Though his first motion listed a lawyer he wished for the Court to appoint on his behalf, Cruz did not sufficiently explain why he could not retain counsel himself. See dkt. 8. Third, the Court concludes at this time that the case does not merit pro bono representation. Cruz has not laid out the facts of what occurred in his initial complaint, nor sufficiently pleaded the claims he seeks to bring against any individual officers or

¹ The Court’s General Orders can be found here: <https://www.cand.uscourts.gov/rules/general-orders/>.

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

municipalities.

For the foregoing reasons, Cruz’s motions to appoint counsel are DENIED without prejudice. Cruz is encouraged to contact the Legal Help Center for assistance in amending his complaint. Appointments can be scheduled by emailing fedpro@sfbar.org or by calling (415) 782-8982. If Cruz’s amended complaint pleads clear, sufficient facts and targets appropriate defendants, Cruz may bring a future motion to appoint pro bono counsel. In any future motion, he must demonstrate that he meets the eligibility requirements of General Order 25.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 18, 2023



CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge