

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

10 ISMAHAN ISMAIL,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 AMAZON.COM,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. C16-1682JLR


ORDER

15 Before the court is Plaintiff Ismahan Ismail's motion to appoint counsel. (Mot.
16 (Dkt. # 12).) Mr. Ismail, who is proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis* (10/31/16
17 Order (Dkt. # 2)), seeks a court-appointed attorney (*see* Mot.), which the court has
18 discretion to request on his behalf, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). On January 30, 2017,
19 pursuant to the Western District of Washington's plan for court-appointed representation
20 of civil rights litigants, the court concluded that Mr. Ismail had demonstrated an adequate
21 basis to refer his case to the Screening Committee. (*See* 1/30/17 Order (Dkt. # 13) (citing
22 General Order, August 1, 2010, Section 3(c) (In re Amended Plan for the Representation

1 of Pro Se Litigants in Civil Rights Actions)).) The Screening Committee has
2 recommended the appointment of counsel.

3 No later than April 7, 2017, the court DIRECTS the Clerk to identify counsel from
4 the Pro Bono Panel who would be willing to represent Mr. Ismail in this action. If the
5 Clerk cannot locate counsel within that timeframe who is willing to represent Mr. Ismail
6 on a pro bono basis, the court will be unable to appoint counsel. If the Clerk timely
7 identifies pro bono counsel, the court will issue an order of appointment.¹ The court
8 DIRECTS the Clerk to send a copy of this order to Mr. Ismail and to the Western District
9 of Washington's Pro Bono Coordinator. Finally, the court DIRECTS the Clerk to renote
10 Mr. Ismail's motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. # 12) for April 7, 2017.

11 Dated this RD 23 day of February, 2017.

12 
13 JAMES L. ROBART
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19

20 _____
21 ¹ In its January 30, 2017, order, the court vacated the initial scheduling order and
22 indicated that it would "issue a new initial scheduling order after determining whether Mr. Ismail
will receive appointed counsel." (1/30/17 Order at 2 (citing Sched. Order (Dkt. # 8)).) Because
the court has not yet determined whether Mr. Ismail will receive court appointed counsel, the
court declines to set an initial scheduling order at this time.