

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

AMY MCBRIDE, Plaintiff v. LEBANON COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, et al., Defendants	: : : : : : : : : :	CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:13-CV-2336 (Chief Judge Conner)
---	--	---

ORDER

AND NOW, this 21st day of October, 2013, upon consideration of the *pro se* plaintiff's motions (Doc. 12-13) for appointment of counsel and for an extension of time to file objections to the magistrate judge's report and recommendation (Doc. 11), and the court observing as a threshold matter that indigent civil plaintiffs are not entitled to counsel, see Montgomery v. Pinchak, 294 F.3d 492, 498 (3d Cir. 2002) ("Indigent civil litigants possess neither a constitutional nor a statutory right to appointed counsel"), but that 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) permits a district court to request an attorney to represent an indigent plaintiff on a *pro bono* basis if circumstances compel that result, see 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) ("The court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel."), and the court further observing that the Third Circuit has directed courts to consider such factors as the plaintiff's ability to present his or her case, the complexity of the legal issues, the degree of factual investigation required, whether the case requires expert witness testimony, and whether the litigant can otherwise afford to retain counsel in making the appointment determination, Parham v. Johnson, 126 F.3d 454, 457

(3d Cir. 1997), but noting that the plaintiff has offered no intelligible argument or explanation in support of her blanket demand for counsel (Doc. 12 (citing generally to Parham and § 1915(e) and requesting the court to “assign an attorney”)), and the court declining to presume that the balance of the relevant Parham factors weigh in favor of requesting *pro bono* counsel without a factual basis upon which to do so, but nonetheless concluding that an extension of time in which to file objections is warranted in deference to the plaintiff’s *pro se* status, it is hereby ORDERED that:

1. The motion (Doc. 12) for appointment of counsel pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) is DENIED.
2. The motion (Doc. 13) for an extension of time in which to file objections to the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation (Doc. 11) is GRANTED.
3. Plaintiff shall file any objections to the magistrate judge’s report and recommendation (Doc. 11) by the close of business on November 8, 2013.

/S/ CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
Christopher C. Conner, Chief Judge
United States District Court
Middle District of Pennsylvania