UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,

ARTHUR BAKER,

13 vs.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.,

Order Denying Motion for Appointment of Counsel and Denying Motion for 60 Day Extension of Time [Doc. No. 31]

CASE NO. 07cv1773 - IEG - NLS

Defendant.

Plaintiff moves the Court (1) for appointment of counsel and (2) a 60 day extension of time to contact counsel. (Doc. No. 3.) The Constitution provides no right to appointment of counsel in a civil case unless an indigent litigant may lose his physical liberty if he loses the litigation. Lassiter v. Dept. of Social Services, 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981). Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), however, district courts are granted discretion to appoint counsel for indigent persons under "exceptional circumstances." Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991). "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 [her] claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.' Neither of these issues is dispositive and both must be viewed together before reaching a decision." Id. At this stage of the proceedings, the Court does not believe appointment of counsel is necessary. Plaintiff's complaint adequately sets for the factual and legal basis of his claims, and the issues are

1	not particularly complex. Further plaintiff has adequately represented himself through the
2	proceedings thus far. Therefore, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel.
3	Because the Court denies the appointment of counsel, the request for a 60 day extension of time is
4	DENIED as moot.
5	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED.
7	DATED: February 6, 2009
8	Jona E. Housalen
9	IRMA E. GONZALEZ, Chief Judge United States District Court
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	

28