1

01		
02		
03		
04		
05		
06		
07		TATES DISTRICT COURT
08	WESTERN D	ISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE
09	FRED A. STEPHENS,) $(ASENO C12 1067 DALMAT)$
10	Plaintiff,) CASE NO. C12-1067-RAJ-MAT
11	v.))) ODDED DE: DEQUESTEOD
12	SGT. FREDRICKSON, et al.,) ORDER RE: REQUEST FOR) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL AND) MOTION TO AMEND
13	Defendants.) MOTION TO AMEND
14	·)

15 Plaintiff Fred A. Stephens proceeds pro se in this civil rights matter pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff seeks the appointment of counsel and leave to submit a second 16 17 amended complaint. (Dkts. 25, 28 & 29.) Respondent submitted an objection to the request 18 for appointment of counsel and to the request to amend as set forth in the first motion to amend 19 filed by plaintiff. (Dkt. 26.) The Court has not yet received a response to the second motion 20 filed by plaintiff seeking an amendment (Dkt. 29), but that motion was not correctly noted 21 under the local rules. Now, having considered the pending motions, the Court does hereby 22 find and ORDER as follows:

ORDER PAGE -1 01 (1)There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under § 1983 or in a general civil case. Although the Court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request counsel to 02represent a party proceeding in forma pauperis (IFP), plaintiff is no longer proceeding IFP in 03 04this matter and, even if he were, he has not shown exceptional circumstances warranting the 05 appointment of counsel. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986) (a 06 finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the individual to articulate his claims pro se in light of the 07 complexity of the legal issues involved). The Court, in particular, notes that plaintiff has not 08 09 demonstrated an inability to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal 10 issues involved. *Id.* Accordingly, plaintiff's request for the appointment of counsel (Dkt. 25) is DENIED. 11

12 (2)Plaintiff seeks to amend his complaint to add one or more new defendants and a claim for declaratory and injunctive relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2201. However, plaintiff 13 failed to submit a proposed second amended complaint. Any motion to amend not 14 15 accompanied by a proposed amended complaint is procedurally deficient and will not be considered. Accordingly, plaintiff's motions seeking joinder and the filing of a second 16 amended complaint (Dkts. 25 & 29) are hereby STRICKEN from the docket. If plaintiff 17 18 wishes to pursue amendment of his complaint, he must submit a new motion to amend together 19 with a proposed second amended complaint which sets forth each claim plaintiff wishes to 20pursue against each named defendant.

(3) Plaintiff is reminded that, pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(d)(2), all motions filed
in a case in which a party is under civil or criminal confinement must be noted in accordance

ORDER PAGE -2

01	with Rule $7(d)(1)$ or $7(d)(3)$, the latter of which requires a noting date no earlier than the third	
02	Friday after filing. As such, any motion to amend filed by plaintiff must be noted no earlier	
03	than the third Friday after filing.	
04	(4) The Clerk shall direct copies of this Order to the parties and to the Honorable	
05	Richard A. Jones.	
06	DATED this <u>16th</u> day of October, 2012.	
07	mag a de a Mum	
08	Mary Alice Theiler	
09	United States Magistrate Judge	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
	ORDER PAGE -3	