

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

| | | |
|------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|
| JOE DEWAYNE FITZER, |) | |
| |) | |
| Petitioner, |) | |
| |) | |
| v. |) | No. CIV 18-283-RAW-GLJ |
| |) | |
| RICK WHITTEN. Warden, |) | |
| |) | |
| Respondent. |) | |

OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Petitioner has filed a motion requesting the Court to appoint counsel (Dkt. 49). He bears the burden of convincing the Court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant such appointment. *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 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 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 for appointment of counsel (Dkt. 49) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 16th day of May 2023.



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