

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
10

11 JUDY DUGAN; and DAVID CRAFT,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 vs.

14 UNITED STATE OF AMERICA; and
15 REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
16 CALIFORNIA,

17 Defendants.

CASE NO. 10cv0042 JM(WMC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

18 Plaintiffs Judy Dugan and David Craft move for appointment of counsel. While the
19 application represents that this an employment action, the court notes that the complaint alleges a
20 single claim for medical malpractice. (Complaint, Docket No. 1). The Constitution provides no right
21 to appointment of counsel in a civil case. See Lassiter v. Dept. of Social Services, 452 U.S. 18, 25
22 (1981). Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), however, district courts are granted discretion to appoint
23 counsel for indigent persons under “exceptional circumstances.” Terrell v. Brewer, 935 F.2d 1015,
24 1017 (9th Cir. 1991). “A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the
25 ‘likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate [his or her] claims pro
26 se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.’ Neither of these issues is dispositive and
27 both must be viewed together before reaching a decision.” Id. (quoting Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789
28 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986)).


Here, it appears that Plaintiffs have a sufficient grasp of their case, the legal issues involved,
and are able to adequately articulate the basis for their claims. Accordingly, Plaintiffs’ request for

1 appointment of counsel is denied because it is not warranted by the interests of justice. LaMere v.
2 Risley, 827 F.2d 622, 626 (9th Cir. 1987).

3 In sum, the motion for appointment of counsel is denied.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 DATED: April 15, 2010

6 
7 Hon. Jeffrey T. Miller
United States District Judge

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28