

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

10 JOSEPH FLORES SANCHEZ,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 JOHN DOE, JOHN DOE,
WASHINGTON STATE
14 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
JOHN DOE, JANE DOE, MARGARET
15 GILBERT, JANE 1-3 DOE, DENNIS
CHERRY, JOHN DOE CORNWELL,

16 Defendants.
17

CASE NO. 3:16-CV-05201-BHS-DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION

18 Plaintiff, proceeding *pro se* and *in forma pauperis*, filed this civil rights Complaint
19 pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See* Dkt. 1. Presently before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for
20 Reconsideration for Denying Appointment of Counsel ("Motion"). Dkt. 11. After reviewing the
21 Motion and relevant record, the Court denies the Motion as it does not meet the standard outlined
22 in Local Civil Rule 7(h).
23
24

1 In his Motion, Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of the Court's Order denying Plaintiff's
2 Motion for Appointment of Counsel. Dkt. 11. On April 22, 2016, the Court denied Plaintiff's
3 Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Dkt. 8) because Plaintiff did not show (1) the case involves
4 complex facts or law; (2) an inability to articulate the factual basis of his claims in a fashion
5 understandable to the Court; or (3) he is likely to succeed on the merits of his case. Dkt. 10. In
6 his Motion, Plaintiff reiterates he needs court appointed counsel because he lacks the skill and
7 knowledge to present his case and will fail without the assistance of counsel. Dkt. 11.

8 Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 7(h), motions for reconsideration are disfavored and will be
9 denied absent a showing of manifest error or a showing of new facts or legal authority which
10 could not have been presented earlier with reasonable diligence.

11 Plaintiff has not met the standard outlined in Local Civil Rule 7(h). Plaintiff fails to show
12 a manifest error in the Court's prior ruling. Plaintiff also fails to provide new facts or legal
13 authority which could not have been presented earlier or show this case presents an "exceptional
14 circumstance" requiring the appointment of counsel. *See Rand v. Roland*, 113F.3d 1520, 1525
15 (9th Cir. 1997), *overruled on other grounds*, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998); *Wilborn v.*
16 *Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986).

17 As the Motion does not meet the standard outlined in Local Civil Rule 7(h) or show
18 appointment of counsel is appropriate at this time, Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration is
19 denied.

20 Dated this 5th day of May, 2016.

21 

22 David W. Christel
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24