

HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT TACOMA

MICHELLE GILBERT,

Plaintiff,

v.

CLARK COUNTY SHERIFF, et al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. C15-5550 RBL

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
COURT-APPOINTED ATTORNEY

[Dkt. #5]

THIS MATTER is before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Michelle Gilbert’s motion for court-appointed counsel.


In exceptional circumstances, the court may ask an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). *Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984). To find exceptional circumstances, the court must evaluate the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the petitioner to articulate the claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983).

While the Court previously granted Gilbert’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis*, it cannot be said that she has shown any likelihood of success on the merits of her claim.

1 Gilbert's suit broadly and cryptically claims that officers unconstitutionally restrained her son.
2 But she has not identified the "who what when where why" of a likely-to-succeed claim against
3 any of the named defendants. Her Motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5
6 Dated this 23rd day of September, 2015.

7
8 

9 Ronald B. Leighton
10 United States District Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24