Murray v. Patton Doc. 11

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

| BEN FRANKLIN MURRAY, |) | |
|------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Petitioner, |) | |
| v. |) | No. CIV 14-259-JHP-KEW |
| ROBERT PATTON, DOC Director, |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

OPINION AND ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Petitioner 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 petitioner's claim, 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 petitioner'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, petitioner's motion (Docket No. 8) is DENIED.

DATED this 17th day of October 2014.

United States District Judge Eastern District of Oklahoma