U

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

Plaintiff,

vs.

ERICA COTY GRISWALD, et al.,

Defendant.

DWIQUITA LANETTE RUTLEDGE,

Case No. 2:15-cv-2175-APG-GWF

ORDER

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time for Service of the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 10), Motion for Service by the U.S. Marshal Regarding the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 11), Motion for Hearing (ECF No. 12) and Motion for Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 13), filed on August 9, 2016.

On May 1, 2017, the District Court dismissed Plaintiff's amended complaint on the grounds that the Court lacks jurisdiction over her claims. *See Order* (ECF No. 30). As such, Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time for Service (ECF No. 10), Motion for Service by the U.S. Marshal (ECF No. 11) and Motion for Hearing (ECF No. 12) are moot and will therefore be denied.

The Court will also deny Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 13). There is no constitutional right to the appointment of counsel in civil cases. *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Alaska*, 673 F.2d 266, 269 (9th Cir. 1982). A court may only designate counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) in exceptional circumstances. *Agyeman v. Corrs. Corp. of Am.*, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied sub nom. Gerber v. Agyeman*, 545 U.S. 1128 (2005). In determining whether counsel should be appointed, the Court has discretion to consider four relevant factors: (1) the plaintiff's financial resources; (2) the efforts made by the plaintiff to secure counsel; (3) the meritoriousness of the plaintiff's claim; and (4) the ability of the petitioner to articulate his

2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		I
4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		2
5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		3
6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		4
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		5
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		6
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		7
10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		8
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27		9
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	0
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	1
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	2
15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	3
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	4
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	5
18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	6
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	1	7
2021222324252627	1	8
21222324252627	1	9
222324252627	2	0
2324252627	2	1
24252627	2	2
252627	2	3
26 27	2	4
27	2	5
	2	6
20	2	7
28	2	8
/ X	2	Ω

claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *Ivey*, 673 F.2d at 269; *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). Plaintiff has not made the requisite showing that she should be appointed counsel.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion to Extend Time for Service of the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 10), Motion for Service by the U.S. Marshal Regarding the Amended Complaint (ECF No. 11) and Motion for Hearing (ECF No. 12) are **denied** as moot.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion for Appointment of Counsel (ECF No. 13) is **denied** without prejudice.

DATED this 4th day of May, 2017.

GEORGE FOLEY, JR. United States Magistrate Judge