1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA

BOBBY JOE JOHNSON, JR.,

Plaintiff,

v.

DAN PACHOLKE, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. C08-5426BHS

ORDER DENYING MOTION TO APPOINT COUNSEL

The Court, having reviewed Plaintiff's request for appointment of counsel, (Dkt. #18), the pleadings filed in support and in opposition thereto, and the balance of the record, does hereby find and ORDER:

(1) There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
Although the court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), can request counsel to represent a party proceeding *in forma pauperis*, the court may do so only in exceptional circumstances. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d
1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); <u>Franklin v. Murphy</u>, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984); <u>Aldabe v. Aldabe</u>,
616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the
likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of
the complexity of the legal issues involved. <u>Wilborn</u>, 789 F.2d at 1331.

Plaintiff has demonstrated an adequate ability to articulate his claims *pro se*. Moreover, it
 appears that this case does not involve exceptional circumstances which warrant appointment of counsel.
 Accordingly, Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel is **DENIED**.
 DATED this 5th day of January, 2009.

<u>/s/ J. Kelley Arnold</u> J. Kelley Arnold United States Magistrate Judge

26

27

28