Miller v. Scott et al Doc. 58

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

VICTOR CORNELL MILLER,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	**No. CIV 11-352-RAW-SPS**
	)	
WADE SCOTT, et al.,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

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. 30] is DENIED.

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

Dated this 27th day of September, 2012.

Ronald A. White
United States District Judge
Eastern District of Oklahoma

Dockets.Justia.com