Blatner v. Ochs et al Doc. 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI SOUTHEASTERN DIVISION

| AARON KEITH BLATNER, |) | |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----|
| Plaintiff, |) | |
| v. |) No. 1:18CV186 HI | ΞA |
| CHARLES OCHS, et al., |) | |
| Defendants. |)) | |

OPINION, MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court upon plaintiff Aaron Keith Blatner's motion to appoint counsel. The motion will be denied without prejudice.

"A pro se litigant has no statutory or constitutional right to have counsel appointed in a civil case." Stevens v. Redwing, 146 F.3d 538, 546 (8th Cir. 1998). When determining whether to appoint counsel for an indigent litigant, the Court considers factors such as the complexity of the case, the ability of the pro se litigant to investigate the facts, the existence of conflicting testimony, and the ability of the pro se litigant to present his claims. Id.

After considering these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. This case is neither factually nor legally complex. In addition, plaintiff has demonstrated that he can adequately present his claims to the Court, and it does not appear that his claims involve information unavailable to him. However, the Court recognizes that circumstances may change. The Court will therefore deny the motion for the appointment of counsel without prejudice, and will entertain future motions for the appointment of counsel, if appropriate, as this case progresses.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel (Docket No. 4) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

Dated this 20th day of November, 2018.

HENRY EDWARD AUTREY
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hang Swand Ruley