1 2 3 4 5 6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 8 9 VIVIAN BURNS, 10 11 Plaintiff, Case No. C20-1555RSM 12 v. ORDER DENYING MOTION TO 13 APPOINT COUNSEL **INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS** 14 MACHINES CORPORATION, 15 Defendant. 16 17 This matter comes before the Court on the Motion to Appoint Counsel filed by Plaintiff 18 Vivian Burns. Dkt. #6. Defendant has appeared and filed an Answer. Dkt. #11. 19 In civil cases, the appointment of counsel to a pro se litigant "is a privilege and not a 20 right." United States ex. Rel. Gardner v. Madden, 352 F.2d 792, 793 (9th Cir. 1965) (citation 21 22 omitted). "Appointment of counsel should be allowed only in exceptional cases." Id. (citing 23 Weller v. Dickson, 314 F.2d 598 (9th Cir. 1963)). A court must consider together "both the 24 likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims pro se

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL - 1

in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954

(9th Cir. 1983). In "exceptional circumstances," a district court may appoint counsel for indigent

25

26

27

28

civil litigants. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1); *Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), *overruled on other grounds*, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998).

Ms. Burns sets forth her efforts to retain an attorney but has failed to set forth exceptional circumstances warranting the appointment of counsel in this case. She has demonstrated sufficient ability to articulate her claims. Given all of the above, this Motion will be denied.

Having considered Plaintiff's Motion and the remainder of the record, this Motion is DENIED. The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at 10605 SE 240TH ST #344 KENT, WA 98031.

DATED this 21st day of December, 2020.

RICARDO S. MARTINEZ CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE