

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

ROBERT E. HUNT,)	4:11CV3086
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
)	
ROBERT HOUSTON, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court on Plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint Counsel (filing no. [33](#)) and Motion for Reconsideration (filing no. [32](#)). As the court has previously informed Plaintiff, it cannot routinely appoint counsel in civil cases. In *Davis v. Scott*, 94 F.3d 444, 447 (8th Cir. 1996), the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals explained that “[i]ndigent civil litigants do not have a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel. . . . The trial court has broad discretion to decide whether both the plaintiff and the court will benefit from the appointment of counsel . . .” *Id.* (quotation and citation omitted). At this stage of the proceedings, no such benefit is apparent here. Plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint Counsel is again denied without prejudice.

Plaintiff also seeks reconsideration of the court’s previous denial of his request for a temporary restraining order. (Filing No. [32](#).) The court has carefully reviewed Plaintiff’s Motion and finds no good cause for reconsideration of any portion of its September 6, 2011, Memorandum and Order which denied Plaintiff’s Motion for Temporary Restraining Order. (Filing No. [10](#).)

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that: Plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint Counsel (filing no. [33](#)) and Motion for Reconsideration (filing no. [32](#)) are denied.

DATED this 2nd day of March, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

Richard G. Kopf

Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.