

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS**

**SCOTT HARRIS KOBEL,**

**Plaintiff,**

**v.**

**DON DUNKLE, et al.,**

**Defendants.**

**Case No. 16-3227-CM-DJW**

**ORDER**

The matter before the Court is on Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel (Doc. 16). For the reasons below, the Court denies Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel.

Section 1915(e)(1) provides that the "court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). In addition to determining the financial need of the movant, if the court determines the movant has a colorable claim, then it "should consider the nature of the factual issues raised in the claim and the ability of the plaintiff to investigate the crucial facts." *Rucks v. Boergermann*, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995) (citing *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing *Maclin v. Freake*, 650 F.2d 885, 887 (7th Cir. 1981)). The Tenth Circuit has adopted several factors for determining whether appointment of counsel is appropriate, including: "the merits of the litigant's claims, the nature of the factual issues raised in the claims, the litigant's ability to present his claims, and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims." *Id.* (citing *Williams v. Messe*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991) (citing *Maclin v. Freake*, 650 F.2d 885, 886 (7th Cir. 1981)).

Considering the above factors, the Court concludes in this case that (1) it is not clear at this juncture that Plaintiff has asserted a colorable claim; (2) the issues are not complex; and (3) Plaintiff appears capable of adequately presenting facts and arguments. Accordingly, the Court

denies Plaintiff's motions to appoint counsel at this time. However, this denial is without prejudice. If it becomes apparent that appointed counsel is necessary as this case further progresses, Plaintiff may renew his motion.

**IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED BY THE COURT** that Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel (Doc. 16) is denied without prejudice. If it becomes apparent that appointed counsel is necessary as this case further progresses, Plaintiff may renew his motion.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated June 14, 2017, at Kansas City, Kansas.

s/ David J. Waxse  
David J. Waxse  
U.S. Magistrate Judge