

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

MICHAEL CORTEZ ROWE,

Plaintiff,

v.

NURSE TRISH, KAREN ANDERSON,
SGT. HAGG, LT. KARNA
and DAVID SPANNAGEL,

Defendants.

ORDER

14-cv-195-bbc

Pro se prisoner Michael Cortez Rowe has filed his second motion for assistance in recruiting counsel, dkt. #20, only two weeks after the court denied his first motion. Dkt. #18. I denied the first motion because plaintiff had failed to comply with this court's requirement to submit letters from three lawyers who had refused his request for representation and because it was too early to determine whether the complexity of the case exceeds his ability to litigate, as required by Pruitt v. Mote, 503 F.3d 647, 654-55 (7th Cir. 2007).

In his new motion, plaintiff cites two rejection letters that he has received from lawyers, so he still needs one more before the court can consider his request for counsel. (Plaintiff says that he received a third rejection letter, but he admits it was from the same law firm that sent one of the other two letters, so I cannot consider that letter.) Even if

plaintiff had complied with the requirement to attempt to find counsel on his own, I would deny his request because he has not shown any new grounds for needing counsel. He says that he has “ADHD” and an unspecified “mental problem,” but he has not submitted any medical records or other evidence showing how any problem he has prevents him from litigating this case. As I explained in the previous order, plaintiff’s filings thus far do not show that he is unable to represent himself. If later developments in the case show that plaintiff is unable to represent himself, he is free to raise this issue again.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Michael Cortez Rowe’s motion for assistance in recruiting counsel, dkt. #20, is DENIED.

Entered this 13th day of April, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

BARBARA B. CRABB

District Judge