

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

DILSON ROBLEDO

v.

CORRECTIONAL OFFICER  
BENEVIDES, et. al.,

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

C.A. No. 13-604L

**MEMORANDUM AND ORDER**

Before this Court is Plaintiff Dilson Robledo’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel. (Document No. 19). The Motion for Appointment of Counsel has been referred to me for determination. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A); LR Cv 72(a). For the reasons set forth below, Plaintiff’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel is DENIED.

In the appropriate case, the Court may “request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel” in a civil case. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1). However, there is no absolute right to appointed counsel in a civil case. DesRosiers v. Moran, 949 F.2d 15, 23-24 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1991). Plaintiff bears the burden of demonstrating that “exceptional circumstances [a]re present such that a denial of counsel [i]s likely to result in fundamental unfairness impinging on his due process rights.” DesRosiers, 949 F.2d at 23. In determining whether exceptional circumstances exist, the Court must examine the total situation, considering inter alia, the merits of the case, the complexity of the legal issues and the litigant’s ability to represent himself. Id. In this case, Plaintiff has not demonstrated “exceptional circumstances” sufficient to convince the Court that he is entitled to appointed counsel in this civil action.

From a review of the documents filed in this case to the present time, the Court finds that Plaintiff has the capacity to prosecute the claim, and that Plaintiff has a basic understanding of the

legal procedures to be followed. Although Plaintiff asserts that English is not his first language, his submissions to the Court have clearly set forth his claims and have been easy to understand. Plaintiff has also been able to keep up with a steady stream of filings in this matter. Additionally, Plaintiff succinctly states the nature of his claims as “violation of the 8<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by officials acting under color of state law.” (Document No. 1 at 3). Thus, the Court determines that Plaintiff does not, at this time, meet the test for appointment of counsel and will, therefore, be required to prosecute this action by himself.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED, that Plaintiff’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Document No. 19) is DENIED without prejudice.

/s/ Lincoln D. Almond  
LINCOLN D. ALMOND  
United States Magistrate Judge  
June 5, 2014