

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
7 AT TACOMA

8 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 ELAINE GIBNEY,

12 Defendant.

CASE NO. C14-5969 BHS
C14-5970BHS

ORDER DENYING MOTIONS
FOR APPOINTMENT OF
COUNSEL

13
14 This matter comes before the Court on Defendant Elaine Gibney's ("Gibney")
15 motions for a court appointed counsel (C14-5969, Dkt. 11 & C14-5970, Dkt. 10).

16 On December 30, 2014, Gibney filed the instant motions requesting that the court
17 appoint her counsel in these forfeiture proceedings because she is unable to afford
18 counsel. *Id.* Although a court, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e), can request counsel to
19 represent a party, the court may do so only in exceptional circumstances. *Rand v.*
20 *Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997). A finding of exceptional circumstances
21 requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of
22

1 the party to articulate her claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues
2 involved. *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986).

3 In this case, the Court is unable to conclude that exceptional circumstances exist to
4 appoint counsel to represent Gibney. In her letter, Gibney states that her claims and/or
5 defenses are more equitable in nature rather than being legal in nature. She asserts that
6 the funds that the Government is attempting to seize are essential sources of income and
7 that she is diligently striving to make her restitution payments. These are not complex
8 claims and Gibney has filed detailed financial documents for the Court's consideration.
9 Therefore, the Court **DENIES** Gibney's motions for appointment of counsel.

10 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

11 Dated this 3rd day of February, 2015.

12
13 

14

BENJAMIN H. SETTLE
United States District Judge