

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

<b>BRYON T. WATSON,</b>	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	<b>No. CIV 14-454-RAW-SPS</b>
	)	
<b>CORRECTIONS CORPORATION</b>	)	
<b>OF AMERICA, et al.,</b>	)	
Defendants.	)	


**OPINION AND ORDER**  
**DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL**

Plaintiff has filed a second motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. 48), raising the same issues as his first motion requesting the court to appoint counsel (Dkt. 16). He still 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 reexamined 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 still 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 second motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. 48) is DENIED.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 12th day of May 2016.

**Dated this 12<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2016.**

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