UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CHARLES WUNDERLICH,

Plaintiff,

v.

DR. ALLRED, et al.,

Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-1847-TLN-CKD

ORDER

On May 4, 2026, Plaintiff filed a document that the Court construes as a request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's April 22, 2026 order denying Plaintiff's motion for the appointment of counsel. (ECF Nos. 36, 39.) Pursuant to E.D. Local Rule 303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the Court finds that it does not appear that the magistrate judge's ruling is clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

With respect to Plaintiff's alternative request that the Court reconsider the motion as the case develops, the Court notes the magistrate judge's order found that "plaintiff has failed to meet his burden of demonstrating exceptional circumstances warranting the appointment of counsel *at this time*." (ECF No. 36 (emphasis added).) The order therefore does not prevent Plaintiff from filing another motion to appoint counsel in the future.

///

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (ECF No. 39) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: May 15, 2026

TROY L. NUNLEY
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE