1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8		
9	RALPH HOWARD BLAKELY,	CASE NO. 3:18-cv-05021-RBL-TFL
10	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER DENYING OBJECTIONS TO MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S ORDER
11	GREGORY JONES, et al,	
12	Defendant.	
13		
14	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Petitioner Ralph Howard Blakely's timely	
15	objection to Magistrate Judge Theresa L. Fricke's order denying plaintiff's motion for	
16	appointment of counsel. Dkt. #89. The underlying complaint alleges claims for outrage and	
17	violation of due process based on the seizure of Blakely's legal documents. Dkt. #1.	
18	On non-dispositive orders issued by a magistrate judge, a "district judge must consider	

<sup>13</sup> Connon-dispositive orders issued by a magistrate judge, a "district judge must consider
<sup>19</sup> timely objections and modify or set aside any part of the order that is contrary to law or clearly
<sup>20</sup> erroneous." Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(a). "Generally, a person has no right to counsel in civil actions,"
<sup>21</sup> but "a court may under 'exceptional circumstances' appoint counsel for indigent civil litigants
<sup>22</sup> pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1)." *Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009). The
<sup>23</sup> court should consider both the litigant's likelihood of success on the merits and their ability to

articulate their own legal claims in light of their complexity. *Id.* "Neither of these considerations
 is dispositive and instead must be viewed together." *Id.*

3 4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Here, the Magistrate Judge denied Blakely's motion on the basis that his claims are not terribly complex, he has not proven himself incapable of articulating his own arguments, and he has not shown a likelihood of success on the merits. Dkt. #86, at 2. In his objections, Blakely largely reiterates his prior arguments about being physically incapacitated and out-matched by the attorney general's office. Dkt. #89. He also insists that he is being wrongly incarcerated and denied medical services. *Id.* However, none of these allegations are sufficient to show that the Magistrate Judge's conclusions were contrary to law or clearly erroneous. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(a).

The Court will not overrule or otherwise alter the Magistrate Judge's decision on the strength of Petitioner's filing. The Motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 14<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2019.

Ronald B. Leighton United States District Judge