

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Joseph Charles Tice,)	C/A No. 3:15-4781-JFA-PJG
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	
)	ORDER
Jerry B. Adger, <i>Head Probation Officer</i> ; Lisa Baker, <i>Probation Officer</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

Plaintiff Joseph Charles Tice, proceeding *pro se*, filed this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 alleging a violation of his constitutional rights. This matter is before the court on the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 33.)

There is no right to appointed counsel in § 1983 cases. Hardwick v. Ault, 517 F.2d 295 (5th Cir. 1975). The court may use its discretion to request counsel to represent an indigent in a civil action. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); Mallard v. United States Dist. Court for S. Dist. of Iowa, 490 U.S. 296 (1989). However, such discretion "should be allowed only in exceptional cases." Cook v. Bounds, 518 F.2d 779, 780 (4th Cir. 1975). Whether exceptional circumstances are present depends on the type and complexity of the case, and the *pro se* litigant's ability to prosecute it. Whisenant v. Yuam, 739 F.2d 160 (4th Cir. 1984), abrogated on other grounds by Mallard, 490 U.S. 296.

Tice summarily argues that an attorney should be appointment due to his mental health issues. Upon review of the file, Tice's filings thus far demonstrate a capacity to present his claims. Further, Tice has presented no evidence supporting a finding that any mental health issues would

interfere with his ability to prosecute his claims. Accordingly, Tice has shown no exceptional or unusual circumstances presented at this time which would justify the appointment of counsel or that he would be denied due process if an attorney were not appointed. Id. Accordingly, the plaintiff's motion requesting counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Paige J. Gossett

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

June 8, 2016
Columbia, South Carolina