

1
2
3
4
5
6

7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

9
10 DE'MARIAN CLEMONS,
11 Plaintiff,
12 v.
13 ROBERT CLINTON HAYES, M.D., *et al.*,
14 Defendants.

15
16 Case No. 2:10-CV-01163-KJD-GWF

17 **ORDER**

18 Before the Court is Defendant Elizabeth Acevedo's Motion for Attorney's Fees (#38). No
19 opposition has been filed.

20 On July 26, 2011, the Court issued an Order (#37) granting Defendant's Motion to Dismiss.
21 Defendant seeks attorney's fees of \$8,690.00 pursuant to 42 U.S.C §1988 which provides in relevant
22 part, that the Court "in its discretion, may allow the prevailing party ... a reasonable attorney's fee as
23 part of the costs..."

24 Courts should be cautious in awarding fees against *pro se* litigants because they lack the
25 ability to recognize when a claim has merit. Miller v. Los Angeles County Bd. of Educ., 827 F.2d
26 617, 620 (9th Cir. 1987). Further, Courts should consider the financial resources of a plaintiff before
awarding fees under §1988. Id.; see also Horn v. Carter, 360 Fed.Appx. 851, 852 (9th Cir. 2009)
(reversing award of attorney's fees against *pro se* prisoner).

1 Defendant argues that she should be awarded attorney's fees, because the Court found that
2 Plaintiff's claims had no merit. Plaintiff is a prisoner representing himself *pro se*. There is no
3 indication that Plaintiff was capable of accurately evaluating his chances of success on his claim.
4 Further, it is highly unlikely that Plaintiff would have the ability to pay the \$8,690.00 fee award
5 requested by Defendant. Defendant has not cited any cases where a court has awarded fees under
6 facts like those present here. Accordingly, the Court declines to exercise its discretion to award
7 Defendant fees.

8 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Defendant's Motion for Attorney's Fees (#38) is
9 **DENIED**.

10 DATED this 9th day of December 2011.



11
12 _____
13 Kent J. Dawson
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26