

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA**

ARTHUR RAY ROBINSON (#425796)

CIVIL ACTION

VERSUS

STATE OF LOUISIANA ET AL.

NO. 05-1016-JJB-RLB

ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the plaintiff's Motion for Court-Appointed Expert Witnesses (Rec. Doc. 275) and Motion for Appointment of Independent Counsel (Rec. Doc. 278). These Motions shall be denied. The Court has previously determined that the appointment of an expert in this case is not warranted under either Rule 706 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or 28 U.S.C. § 1915, *see* Rec. Doc. 42, relying on *Pedraza v. Jones*, 71 F.3d 194, 196-97 (5th Cir. 1995). *See also* *Hulsey v. Thaler*, 421 Fed. Appx. 386, 389 (5th Cir. 2011), *cert. denied*, 132 S.Ct. 1923 (2012) (noting that “[t]he purpose of Rule 706 is to allow ‘the appointment of an expert to aid the court,’ as distinct from an expert appointed for the benefit of a party”); *Hannah v. United States*, 523 F.3d 597, 601 n. 2 (5th Cir. 2008) (noting that a district court “should appoint an expert to aid an indigent party only in ‘compelling circumstances’”). In addition, on several prior occasions, the Court has ruled that the appointment of counsel in this case is not warranted. *See, e.g.*, Rec. Docs. 40, 108, 121 and 245. Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED that the plaintiff's Motion for Court-Appointed Expert

Witnesses (Rec. Doc. 275) and Motion for Appointment of Independent Counsel (Rec. Doc. 278) be and they are hereby **DENIED**.

Signed in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, on March 13, 2014.



RICHARD L. BOURGEOIS, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE