

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH

Aaron Michael Uhl v. Bonds R Us, et al.

Uhl · No. 1:22-cv-00170-DAK-JCB · Decided April 20, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Utah grants Plaintiff Aaron Michael Uhl a 60-day extension to comply with the court’s service-of-process order, setting a deadline of May 19, 2026. The court denies his motion to appoint counsel, concluding that he has not shown that counsel is warranted based on the merits, factual complexity, ability to present his claims, or legal complexity.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Utah
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jared C. Bennett
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Utah
DECIDED	April 20, 2026
DOCKET	1:22-cv-00170-DAK-JCB
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for a 60-day extension of the deadline to comply with an order concerning service of process and moved for appointment of counsel. The court granted the extension and denied appointment of counsel.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Appointment of counsel in a civil case is committed to the district court's sound discretion. The applicant bears the burden of demonstrating sufficient merit and need to warrant requesting counsel.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value.
PARTIES	Aaron Michael Uhl v. Bonds R Us, et al.

TOPICS

- service of process
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Civil procedure
- Prisoner civil rights

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether good cause warranted extending the deadline for Plaintiff to comply with the court's order concerning service of process.
2. Whether Plaintiff demonstrated that requesting counsel was warranted in this civil case.

HOLDINGS

1. For good cause shown, the court granted Plaintiff a 60-day extension and required him to comply with the service-of-process order by May 19, 2026.
2. Plaintiff failed to carry his burden of showing that requesting counsel was necessary. In evaluating the request, the court considered the merits of the claims, the nature of the factual issues, Plaintiff's ability to present his claims, and the complexity of the legal issues.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is no constitutional right to appointed counsel in a civil case.”

“The court may request an attorney to represent any person unable to afford counsel.”

“The appointment of counsel in a civil case is left to the sound discretion of the district court.”

“The burden is upon the applicant to convince the court that there is sufficient merit to his claim[s] to warrant the appointment of counsel.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Aaron Michael Uhl, proceeding pro se and while incarcerated, was required to comply with a prior order concerning service of process. He sought a 60-day extension and appointment of counsel, asserting that counsel was necessary. The court found that his complaint should be served, that the factual and legal issues were not unusually complex, and that his detailed complaint showed familiarity with the relevant facts.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The case was referred by District Judge Dale A. Kimball to Magistrate Judge Jared C. Bennett under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). The court had previously ordered Plaintiff to comply with requirements concerning service of process and had determined that his complaint should be served on Defendants. Plaintiff then sought additional time and appointment of counsel.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Mallard v. U.S. Dist. Court for the S. Dist. of Iowa*, 490 U.S. 296, 307-08 (1989)
- *Durre v. Dempsey*, 869 F.2d 543, 547 (10th Cir. 1989) (per curiam)

- Shabazz v. Askins, 14 F.3d 533, 535 (10th Cir. 1994)
- Rucks v. Boergermann, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995)
- McCarthy v. Weinberg, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (per curiam)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-utah/2026/aaron-michael-uhl-v-bonds-r-us-et-al-97c7drq0>