

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

RONALD ROMANELLI,

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

07-C-19-C

DALIA SULIENE,  
DEPUTY KUHL,  
CPT. KUHL and  
STEVEN ROWE,

Defendants.

---

In an order entered in this case on March 12, 2007, I granted plaintiff Ronald Romanelli leave to proceed on his claim that defendants Dalia Suliene, Deputy Kuhl and Captain Kuhl were deliberately indifferent to his gastrointestinal problems, which plaintiff believes are the result of Crohn's disease, and on his claim that defendants Deputy Kuhl and Captain Kuhl were deliberately indifferent to his vision problems. Finally, I allowed plaintiff to proceed on a claim that defendants Captain Kuhl and Steven Rowe, the Columbia County sheriff, failed to train their employees to respond appropriately to medical complaints.

Plaintiff's complaint was served on the defendants. They have a few weeks remaining

within which to file their response to the complaint. Now before the court is plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel.

Before I can consider a pro se plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel on its merits, I must first find that plaintiff has made reasonable efforts to find a lawyer on his own and has been unsuccessful or that he has been prevented from making such efforts. Jackson v. County of McLean, 953 F.2d 1070 (7th Cir. 1992). Plaintiff does not say that he has been prevented from trying to find a lawyer on his own. To prove that he has made reasonable efforts to find a lawyer, plaintiff must give the court the names and addresses of at least three lawyers that he asked to represent him in this case and who turned him down.

Plaintiff should be aware that even if he is unsuccessful in finding a lawyer on his own, that does not mean that one will be appointed for him. At that point, the court must consider whether plaintiff is able to represent himself given the legal difficulty of the case, and if he is not, whether having a lawyer would make a difference in the outcome of his lawsuit. Zarnes v. Rhodes, 64 F.3d 285 (7th Cir. 1995) (citing Farmer v. Haas, 990 F.2d 319, 322 (7th Cir. 1993)). This case is simply too new to allow the court to evaluate plaintiff's abilities or the likely outcome of the lawsuit. Therefore, the motion will be denied

without prejudice to plaintiff's renewing his request at a later time.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel is DENIED.

Entered this 23d day of March, 2007.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge