

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 92-4831
Summary Calendar

WILLIAM DEXTER WHITE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

RONALD W. COOPER, ET AL.,

Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the
Eastern District of Texas
(CA-9:91-177)

(March 23, 1994)

Before JOLLY, WIENER, and EMILIO M. GARZA, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

William Dexter White, an inmate in the Texas prison system, appeals the denial of a motion for the appointment of counsel in his civil rights suit brought pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. His pro se complaint alleges that a guard used excessive force against him, that prison officials and medical staff were deliberately indifferent to his serious injuries, and that he was denied due

*Local Rule 47.5 provides: "The publication of opinions that have no precedential value and merely decide particular cases on the basis of well-settled principles of law imposes needless expense on the public and burdens on the legal profession." Pursuant to that Rule, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published.

process in prison disciplinary proceedings. Although the district court denied White's motion for appointment of counsel on grounds that the case was not complicated enough to warrant counsel, the district court stated that "counsel will be appointed, if at all, only when the court concludes counsel is necessary." We conclude that the district court did not abuse its discretion. This case is the typical run-of-the-mill § 1983 prisoner case. It is not particularly complex. The prisoner is able to make an adequate presentation in his own behalf, no unusual investigation is required in order to establish his claim, and no great legal skills are required in the presentation of this evidence or in cross-examination of witnesses.

Because the district court did not abuse its discretion or otherwise commit error, its order denying the plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is

A F F I R M E D.