

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Joseph Dale Young v. NaphCare Inc.

Young v. NaphCare Inc. · No. 25-cv-07382-VKD · Decided October 30, 2025

SUMMARY

The court granted, as modified, Joseph Dale Young’s motion to continue case-management deadlines and reset the initial case-management conference for January 20, 2026. The court denied without prejudice his motion for appointment of counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), finding no exceptional circumstances warranting appointment at that stage.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Virginia K. DeMarchi
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Northern District of California
DECIDED	October 30, 2025
DOCKET	25-cv-07382-VKD
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved to continue all case-management deadlines and moved under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) for appointment of counsel. The district court granted the continuance request as modified and denied the motion for counsel without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Appointment of counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1) is discretionary and requires exceptional circumstances, evaluated by considering the likelihood of success on the merits and the litigant's ability to articulate claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; limited precedential value.
PARTIES	Joseph Dale Young v. NaphCare Inc.

TOPICS

- civil procedure
- section 1983
- civil rights

PRACTICE AREAS

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should continue all case-management deadlines until sixty days after Young's release from custody.
2. Whether Young had established exceptional circumstances warranting appointment of counsel under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1).

HOLDINGS

1. The court declined to continue all case-management deadlines indefinitely pending Young's release but granted a limited continuance, resetting the initial case-management conference for January 20, 2026 and adjusting related deadlines accordingly.
2. An indigent civil litigant may receive appointed counsel under § 1915(e)(1) only in exceptional circumstances, and Young's motion was denied without prejudice because the circumstances did not warrant appointment at that time.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“There is no constitutional right to counsel in a civil case unless an indigent litigant may lose his physical liberty if he loses the litigation.” (at 2)

“A motion for the appointment of counsel for an indigent litigant under § 1915 may be granted, in the Court’s discretion, only in exceptional circumstances, which requires consideration of “the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims pro se in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.”” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Young brought a § 1983 action alleging that he received inadequate medical services while incarcerated at the Santa Cruz County Jail. After filing the action pro se and being granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, he advised the court that he would be incarcerated and requested that all case-management deadlines be continued until sixty days after his release. He also sought appointed counsel based on the asserted complexity of the medical, correctional-policy, and corporate-practices issues and his lack of legal training and resources.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Young filed this § 1983 action on September 2, 2025, alleging inadequate medical services during his incarceration at the Santa Cruz County Jail. The court granted in forma pauperis status, and the complaint and summons were served on October 24, 2025. While the action was pending, Young sought a continuance because of his incarceration and sought appointment of counsel; the court ruled on both motions in this order.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- *Lassiter v. Department of Social Services*, 452 U.S. 18, 25 (1981)
- *Rand v. Rowland*, 113 F.3d 1520, 1525 (9th Cir. 1997), withdrawn in part on other grounds on reh'g en banc, 154 F.3d 952 (9th Cir. 1998) (en banc)
- *Terrell v. Brewer*, 935 F.2d 1015, 1017 (9th Cir. 1991)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-northern-district-of-ca/2025/joseph-dale-young-v-naphcare-inc-bhahz1yi>