

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

10 RYAN CROSS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 ROSS, ET AL,

14 Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:18-cv-05186 RJB-JRC

ORDER DENYING
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

15
16 The District Court has referred this 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action to United States Magistrate
17 Judge J. Richard Creatura. Plaintiff Ryan Cross, proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, has
18 pending before the Court a motion for appointment of counsel. Dkt. 46.

19 Although indigent defendants in criminal cases are entitled to appointed counsel, there is
20 no constitutional right to appointed counsel in a § 1983 civil action. See *Storseth v. Spellman*,
21 654 F.2d 1349, 1353 (9th Cir. 1981); see *United States v. \$292,888.04 in U.S. Currency*, 54 F.3d
22 564, 569 (9th Cir. 1995) (“[a]ppointment of counsel under this section is discretionary, not
23 mandatory”). However, in “exceptional circumstances,” a district court may appoint counsel for
24 indigent civil litigants pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) (formerly 28 U.S.C. § 1915(d)). *Rand*

1 v. Roland, 113F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), overruled on other grounds, 154 F.3d 952 (9th
2 Cir. 1998). To decide whether exceptional circumstances exist, the Court must evaluate both “the
3 likelihood of success on the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his claims pro
4 se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328,
5 1331 (9th Cir. 1986) (quoting Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983)). A plaintiff
6 must plead facts showing he has an insufficient grasp of his case or the legal issues involved and
7 an inadequate ability to articulate the factual basis of his claims. Agyeman v. Corrections Corp.
8 of America, 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th Cir. 2004).


9 Plaintiff, who alleges a soy allergy, has asserted that defendants have violated his rights
10 by denying him a soy-free diet. Dkt. 18, p. 3. Plaintiff made a motion for summary judgment,
11 which this Court recommended be denied because whether or not plaintiff suffered from a soy
12 allergy was still an issue of material fact. Dkts. 38, 41, 50. Subsequently, defendants filed a
13 motion for summary judgment. Dkt. 53. Because this Court has not yet made a recommendation
14 on defendant’s motion for summary judgment, it is too early to determine the likelihood of
15 plaintiff’s success on the merits of his claim.

16 Further, plaintiff has not shown that he has an insufficient grasp of either the factual or
17 legal basis for his claim. On the contrary, plaintiff is articulate and able to describe the alleged
18 wrongs and the legal principles underlying them in a way that is understandable to the Court at
19 this time. Plaintiff has filed multiple motions, many of which are duplicative. While this Court
20 does not condone duplicative motions, and some of plaintiff’s pleadings demonstrate his lack of
21 legal training, he appears to be able to articulate himself and understand, to a basic degree, the
22 legal underpinnings of his case. It further demonstrates plaintiff’s ability to maintain awareness
23 of the developments in his case and respond to defendant’s motions. Though it may be easier for
24

1 plaintiff to prosecute his case with the assistance of counsel, convenience alone is not enough to
2 warrant appointment of counsel. Because of this, plaintiff has not demonstrated the exceptional
3 circumstances necessary to for the Court to order appointment of counsel.

4 Therefore, for the reasons stated above, plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel (Dkt. 46) is
5 denied without prejudice, which means that the Court can consider such a motion at a later time
6 after the case has developed further.

7 Dated this 1st day of November, 2018.

8
9
10 

11 J. Richard Creatura
12 United States Magistrate Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24