

claims, and the complexity of the legal arguments.” Phillips, 437 F.3d at 794 (citing Edgington, 52 F.3d at 780).

Having considered the relevant criteria, the Court finds that appointment of counsel is not mandated at this time. The record does not support the need for appointment of counsel at this early stage of the case where no case management order has been issued or discovery begun, as there is no indication of conflicting testimony, factual complexity, or that plaintiff is unable to investigate or present his case. Plaintiff has filed articulate pleadings which indicate he is capable of clear expression and appropriate organization of content—although the pleadings are too long and include too much detail—and the Court concludes it would not be aided at this time by the appointment of counsel. Therefore, the Court will deny plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel without prejudice. Plaintiff may file another motion for appointment of counsel at a later time, and the Court may also reconsider the matter on its own motion at a later time.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED** without prejudice. [Doc. 45]



CHARLES A. SHAW
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated this 20th day of April, 2017.