

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

FILED

MAR 27 2012

ISSAC P. JACKSON,
Plaintiff,
v.
MIKE MULLIN, et al.,
Defendants.

WILLIAM E. GUTHRIE
Clerk U.S. District Court
By Deputy Clerk

No. CIV 11-013-RAW-SPS

OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Plaintiff has filed a motion requesting the court to appoint counsel. He bears the burden of convincing the court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant appointment of counsel. McCarthy v. Weinberg, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing United States v. Masters, 484 F.2d 1251, 1253 (10th Cir. 1973)). The court has carefully reviewed the merits of plaintiff's claims, the nature of factual issues raised in his allegations, and his ability to investigate crucial facts. McCarthy, 753 F.2d at 838 (citing Maclin v. Freake, 650 F.2d 885, 887-88 (7th Cir. 1981)). After considering plaintiff's ability to present his claims and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims, the court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted. See Williams v. Meese, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991); see also Rucks v. Boergermann, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995).

ACCORDINGLY, plaintiff's motion [Docket No. 21] is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 27th day of March 2012.

Ronald A. White
RONALD A. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE