Taylor v. Bailey et al Doc. 29

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI EASTERN DIVISION

SAMUEL LEWIS TAYLOR,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
v.	)	No. 4:12-CV-614 CAS
UNKNOWN BAILEY, et al.,	)	
Defendants.	)	

## MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff Samuel Lewis Taylor's motion for appointment of counsel. For the following reasons, the motion will be denied.

There is no constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel in civil cases. Nelson v. Redfield Lithograph Printing, 728 F.2d 1003, 1004 (8th Cir. 1984). In determining whether to appoint counsel, the Court considers several factors, including (1) whether the plaintiff has presented non-frivolous allegations supporting his or her prayer for relief; (2) whether the plaintiff will substantially benefit from the appointment of counsel; (3) whether there is a need to further investigate and present the facts related to the plaintiff's allegations; and (4) whether the factual and legal issues presented by the action are complex. See Johnson v. Williams, 788 F.2d 1319, 1322-23 (8th Cir. 1986); Nelson, 728 F.2d at 1005.

After considering these factors, the Court finds that the facts and legal issues involved are not so complicated that the appointment of counsel is warranted at this time.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**. [Doc. 25]

CHARLES A. SHAW

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this <u>1st</u> day of October, 2013.