



With respect to Plaintiff's desire for court appointed counsel, for the reasons set forth below, the request is **DENIED**. Generally speaking, there is no right to appointed counsel in civil rights actions. See Wahl v. McIver, 773 F.2d 1169, 1174 (11th Cir. 1986); Hardwick v. Ault, 517 F.2d 295, 298 (5th Cir. 1975). Appointment of counsel is a privilege that is justified only by exceptional circumstances. Lopez v. Reyes, 692 F.2d 15, 17 (5th Cir. 1982). In deciding whether legal counsel should be provided, the Court considers, among other factors, the merits of the plaintiff's claim and the complexity of the issues presented. Holt v. Ford, 682 F.2d 850, 853 (11th Cir. 1989).

In accordance with Holt, and upon a review of the record in this case, the Court notes that the Plaintiff has set forth the essential factual allegations underlying his claims, and that the applicable legal doctrines are readily apparent. As such, there is no present need to provide him with legal counsel. Should it later become apparent that legal assistance is required in order to avoid prejudice to the Plaintiff's rights, the Court, **on its own motion**, will consider assisting him in securing legal counsel at that time. Consequently, **no additional requests for counsel will be necessary.**

**SO ORDERED**, this 15<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2011.

s/ Charles H. Weigle  
Charles H. Weigle  
United States Magistrate Judge