¢	Case 3:18-cv-00325-TWR-DEB Document 70	Filed 03/11/21	PageID.3289	Page 1 of 3
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	UNITED STATES I SOUTHERN DISTRI			
10				
11	DARRYL COTTON, an individual,	Case No.: 1	18-CV-325 TV	VR (DEB)
12	Plaintiff,	ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S		AINTIFF'S EX
13	V.	PARTE MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL		
14	CYNTHIA BASHANT, an individual; JOEL WOHLFEIL, an individual; LARRY	APPOINT	MENI OF CO	JUNSEL
15	GERACI, an individual; REBECCA	(ECF Nos. 3	36, 38)	
16	BERRY, an individual; GINA AUSTIN, an individual; MICHAEL WEINSTEIN,			
17	an individual; JESSICA MCELFRESH, an			
18	individual; and DAVID DEMIAN, an			
19	individual, Defendants.			
20				
21				
22	Plaintiff Darryl Cotton, proceeding pro se, has filed an Ex Parte Motion for			
23	Appointment of Counsel, which is currently before the Court. ("Motion," ECF Nos. 36,			
24	38.) Defendant Michael Weinstein opposes. (ECF No. 39.) For the reasons set forth			
25	below, the Court DENIES Plaintiff's motion.			
26	LEGAL STANDARD			
27	"Generally, a person has no right to	counsel in civi	il actions." P	almer v. Valdez,

27 "Generally, a person has no right to counsel in civil actions." *Palmer v. Valdez*, 28 560 F.3d 965, 970 (9th Cir. 2009). But under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), a court may

"appoint counsel for indigent civil litigants" based on a showing of "exceptional circumstances." Id. (citing Agyeman v. Corrs. Corp. of Am., 390 F.3d 1101, 1103 (9th 2 Cir.2004), cert. denied sub nom. Gerber v. Agveman, 545 U.S. 1128, 125 S.Ct. 2941, 162 L.Ed.2d 867 (2005)). In determining whether exceptional circumstances exist, the court considers (1) the "likelihood of success on the merits" and (2) "the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." Id. (quoting Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir.1983)). "Neither of these considerations is dispositive and instead must be viewed together." Id. (citing Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir.1986)).

ANALYSIS

Here, exceptional circumstances do not exist, and Plaintiff is therefore not entitled to a court-appointed attorney. First, at this early stage in the proceedings, the Court cannot determine whether Plaintiff's case has a likelihood of success on the merits. See Ayala v. Romero, No. 318CV02463CABRBM, 2019 WL 2177261, at *2 (S.D. Cal. May 20, 2019) (finding that the court cannot determine the plaintiff's likelihood of success on the merits given that "litigation is only in the pleading stages."). Second, the legal issues are not complex, and Plaintiff has adequately shown that he can articulate his claims and grievances, as reflected by the First Amended Complaint. See Gravesbey v. Byrd-Hunt, No. 319CV00372CABRBM, 2019 WL 2550656, at *2 (S.D. Cal. June 20, 2019) (finding that plaintiff's Section 1983 claim alleging constitutional violations are not complicated enough to warrant court-appointed counsel, and noting that federal courts "rarely" find a case "to be so complex that it is appropriate to appoint counsel for a civil litigant who faces no loss of liberty in the controversy at hand."). Whether Plaintiff would fare better with counsel is not relevant since "whether a litigant would have fared better with counsel is not the test for appointment of counsel." Barron v. Madden, No. 18CV1287-GPC (NLS), 2019 WL 329493, at *2 (S.D. Cal. Jan. 25, 2019). Lastly, although Plaintiff claims financial difficulties (Motion at 26), that alone does not warrant court-appointed counsel. See Smith v. Midland Credit Mgmt., Inc., No. 18CV2322 JAH (AGS), 2019 WL

1

1923094, at *3 (S.D. Cal. Apr. 30, 2019) (denying the plaintiff's motion for courtappointed counsel "even assuming Plaintiff's limited financial resources").

CONCLUSION

Not much has changed since Judge Bashant originally denied Plaintiff's motion for court-appointed counsel. (*See* ECF No. 14.) And Plaintiff has not shown here that exceptional circumstances exist. For the reasons stated above, the Court **DENIES** Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Appointment of Counsel **WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 11, 2021

Honorable Todd W. Robinson United States District Court