IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

JANE DOE,		
	Plaintiff,	8:17CV97
vs.		ORDER
SHAD KNUTSON,		OAD EX
	Defendant.	

This matter comes before the Court on Defendant's motions for appointment of counsel (<u>Filing Nos. 19</u>, <u>23</u>) and motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. (<u>Filing Nos. 20</u>, <u>24</u>.) The motions will be denied.

"Indigent civil litigants do not have a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel." <u>Davis v. Scott</u>, 94 F.3d 444, 447 (8th Cir. 1996). Trial courts have "broad discretion to decide whether both the [indigent litigant] and the court will benefit from the appointment of counsel, taking into account the factual and legal complexity of the case, the presence or absence of conflicting testimony, and the [indigent litigant's] ability to investigate the facts and present his claim." <u>Id</u>. Having considered these factors, the Court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time.

The Court interprets Defendant's motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis as a mechanism by which Defendant is attempting to obtain counsel. Thus, these motions will be denied.

IT IS ORDERED:

- 1. Defendant's motions for appointment of counsel (Filing Nos. 19, 23) are denied.
- 2. Defendant's motions for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Filing Nos. 20, 24) are denied.

Dated this 17th day of August, 2017.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Susan M. Bazis United States Magistrate Judge