

litigant to investigate the facts, the existence of conflicting testimony, and the ability of the pro se litigant to present his or her claim. *Id.* After considering and weighing these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. This case is neither factually nor legally complex, and it appears that plaintiff is able to present his numerous claims. This is not to say, however, that plaintiff has properly joined all his claims in one action; this issue will be considered at a later time, when the Court reviews the amended complaint under 28 U.S.C. § 1915.

Plaintiff's motion to produce documents is premature, given that the Court has not yet issued a Case Management Order, and it will be denied as such, also without prejudice.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel [Doc. 5] and motion to produce documents [Doc. 6] are **DENIED, without prejudice.**

Dated this 27th day of August, 2015.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE