

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

11 GARY DICKEY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 GILBERT MENDOZA, et al.,

15 Defendants.

Case No.: 17-cv-0206-WQH-AGS

**ORDER REGARDING DICKEY’S  
LETTERS  
(ECF Nos. 17, 19, 22, 24, 28, 31)**

16  
17 Dickey has not been shy about writing the Court about his concerns. (*See* ECF Nos.  
18 17, 19, 22, 24, 28, 31.) In his latest missives, Dickey raises three distinct requests, which  
19 may be construed as motions to: (1) conduct legal research on Proposition 57 for him,  
20 (2) appoint counsel for him, and (3) extend his response deadline to defendant’s motion to  
21 dismiss.

22 **A. Legal Research**

23 Dickey’s request for the Court to conduct legal research on his behalf (ECF No. 28)  
24 is improper and is therefore **DENIED**. The Court may not “inject itself into the adversary  
25 process on behalf of” any litigant. *Jacobsen v. Filler*, 790 F.2d 1362, 1365 (9th Cir. 1986);  
26 *see also id.* at 1365 n.5 (warning that the “trial court is under no obligation to become an  
27 ‘advocate’ for or to assist and guide the *pro se* layman through the trial thicket”) (citations  
28 omitted).

1 **B. Appointed Counsel**

2 This Court previously denied Dickey’s request to appoint him counsel because he  
3 failed to show extraordinary circumstances. (ECF No. 13.) While Dickey re-asserts that he  
4 has a severe mental illness and is on prescription medication (*see, e.g.*, ECF No. 19, at 1),  
5 he again failed to attach any supporting documentation and he still seems able to articulate  
6 the facts of his claim. *See Meeks v. Nunez*, Case No. 13cv973-GPC(BGS), 2017 WL  
7 476425, at \*3 (S.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2017) (“An incapacitating mental disability may be  
8 grounds for appointment of counsel in some cases, but a plaintiff making that argument  
9 must present substantial evidence of incompetence.”) (citation omitted). Thus, the renewed  
10 requests for appointed counsel (ECF Nos. 17, 19, 22, 31) are **DENIED**.

11 **C. Response Deadline**

12 Finally, Dickey’s last letter may be construed, in part, as a motion to extend his  
13 response deadline. But Dickey already filed a timely response to defendant’s motion to  
14 dismiss. (*See* ECF Nos. 20, 26.) In fact, Dickey even filed a second response, which the  
15 Court accepted although it was filed almost two weeks after the deadline and Dickey never  
16 received authorization for supplemental briefing. (*See* ECF Nos. 32–33.) Thus, Dickey’s  
17 motion for an extension of time (ECF No. 31) is **DENIED** as moot.

18  
19  
20 Dated: October 31, 2017

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Andrew G. Schopler  
United States Magistrate Judge