

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
9 AT SEATTLE

10 MATHEW JAMES MIGHELL,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 CITY OF EDMONDS, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. C14-0285-RSM-MAT

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO
APPOINT COUNSEL

15
16 This is a civil rights action brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiff submitted his civil
17 rights complaint to the Court for filing on February 27, 2014. (Dkt. 1.) On April 1, 2014,
18 plaintiff filed a Motion to Appoint Counsel. (Dkt. 12.) The Court, having reviewed plaintiff's
19 motion, and the balance of the record, hereby finds and ORDERS as follows:

20 (1) Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel (Dkt. 12) is DENIED. There is no right to
21 have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Although the Court, under 28
22 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request counsel to represent a party proceeding *in forma pauperis*, the
23 Court may do so only in exceptional circumstances. *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328,
24 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984); *Aldabe v.*

1 *Aldabe*, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an
2 evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to
3 articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *Wilborn*, 789
4 F.2d at 1331.

5 Plaintiff has neither demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits nor shown that, in
6 light of the complexity of the legal issues involved, he is unable to articulate his claims pro se.
7 Thus, plaintiff has not demonstrated that this case involves exceptional circumstances which
8 warrant appointment of counsel at the present time.

9 (2) The Clerk is directed to send a copy of this Order to plaintiff and to the Honorable
10 Ricardo S. Martinez.

11 Dated this 3rd day of April, 2014.

12
13 

14 Mary Alice Theiler
15 Chief United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24