

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS**

<b>CHARLES DONELSON,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>Case No. 15-CV-95-SMY-RJD</b>
	)	
<b>DR. SHEARING, et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiff Charles Donelson’s Appeal of Magistrate Judge Decision (Doc. 252). Plaintiff appeals Magistrate Judge Daly’s ruling appointing him stand-by counsel for trial purposes only. For the following reasons, Plaintiff’s motion is **DENIED** and Judge Daly’s ruling is **AFFIRMED**.

In reviewing a magistrate judge’s ruling on a non-dispositive matter, a district judge should not disturb the ruling unless it is contrary to law or clearly erroneous. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(a); SDIL-LR 73.1(a). There is no constitutional or statutory right to court-appointed counsel in a federal civil case. *See Pruitt v. Mote*, 503 F.3d 647, 649 (7th Cir. 2007). Based on Plaintiff’s documented inability to work with recruited counsel, Judge Daly declined to recruit a second counsel to represent Plaintiff for his upcoming trial. Instead, Judge Daly appointed standby counsel for trial purposes only to assist Plaintiff as procedural issues arise during trial. As Plaintiff has no constitutional or statutory right to court-appointed counsel, Judge Daly’s ruling was neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Accordingly, Plaintiff’s appeal is denied.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATED: July 14, 2017**

**s/ Staci M. Yandle**  
**STACI M. YANDLE**  
**United States District Judge**