

Defendants argue that Plaintiff has no constitutional right to counsel and has not shown exceptional circumstances warranting appointment of counsel.⁹ Specifically, Defendants argue that Plaintiff has had no trouble litigating against three Defendants in the case thus far and provides no evidence that he will in the future.¹⁰

The Court agrees. There is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case.¹¹ Nor does Plaintiff find himself in such “exceptional circumstances” that would warrant appointment of counsel. Therefore, Plaintiff’s motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 2, 2017

s/ James S. Gwin
JAMES S. GWIN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

⁹ Doc. [33](#) at 1-2.

¹⁰ Id. at 2.

¹¹ [Abdur-Rahman v. Michigan Dep’t of Corr.](#), 65 F.3d 489, 492 (6th Cir. 1995).