

Cir. 1982). In deciding whether legal counsel should be provided, the Court should consider, among other factors, the merits of Plaintiff's claim and the complexity of the issues presented. *Holt v. Ford*, 682 F.2d 850, 853 (11th Cir. 1989).

Plaintiff has set forth the essential factual allegations underlying his claims, and the applicable legal doctrines are readily apparent. Plaintiff therefore has not alleged the exceptional circumstances justifying appointment of counsel under *Holt*. The Court on its own motion will consider assisting Plaintiff in securing legal counsel *if and when* it becomes apparent that legal assistance is required in order to avoid prejudice to Plaintiff's rights. Accordingly, Plaintiff's motions for appointment of counsel are DENIED at this time. **Any further motions for appointment of counsel by Plaintiff in this case will be summarily denied.**

Plaintiff also seeks additional time to file a response to Defendant Moss' motion to dismiss. Such request is GRANTED. Plaintiff shall have an additional thirty (30) days within which to file his response to Defendant's motion to dismiss.

SO ORDERED, this 19th day of April, 2013.

S/ Stephen Hyles
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE