

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION

LILLIE HARRIS,

Plaintiff,

v.

MARK T. ESPER,

Defendant.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

No. 4:18-cv-00690-JAR

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff Lillie Harris’ motion for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 3). For the reasons discussed below, plaintiff’s 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). *See also Ward v. Smith*, 721 F.3d 940, 942 (8th Cir. 2013) (“In civil cases, there is no constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel...Rather a court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel”). When determining whether to appoint counsel for an indigent litigant, the Court considers relevant 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 or her claim. *Phillips v. Jasper Cty. Jail*, 437 F.3d 791, 794 (8th Cir. 2006).


After reviewing these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. Plaintiff has demonstrated, at this point, that she can adequately present

her claims to the Court. Additionally, neither the factual nor the legal issues in this case appear to be complex.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 3) is **DENIED** without prejudice.

Dated this 12th day of July, 2018.



JOHN A. ROSS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE