Anderson v. Wilkinson et al Doc. 107

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

JOHNDY ANDERSON,)	
)	
	Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. CIV 16-036-RAW-SPS
)	
TIM WILKINSON, et al.,)	
)	
	Defendants.)	

OPINION AND ORDER DENYING FOURTH MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Plaintiff has filed another motion requesting the Court to appoint counsel (Dkt. 95). 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 again 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 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 fourth motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. 95) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 25th day of April 2018.

Ronald A. White

United States District Judge Eastern District of Oklahoma