

1 WO
2
3
4
5

6 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
7 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA**
8

9 Darryl D Johnson,

10 Petitioner,

11 v.

12 Charles L Ryan, et al.,

13 Respondents.
14

No. CV-17-04473-PHX-GMS (ESW)

ORDER

15
16 Petitioner Darryl D. Johnson, who is confined in the Arizona State Prison
17 Complex-Yuma, filed a pro se Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
18 § 2254 (Doc. 1). The Court ordered Respondents to file an answer (Doc. 5 at 3).

19 Pending before the Court is Petitioner's Motion to Request the Appointment of
20 Counsel (Doc. 8) and Respondents' Response (Doc. 10). Petitioner requests that the
21 Court appoint counsel for Petitioner because (i) Petitioner cannot afford to hire counsel,
22 (ii) Petitioner has a meritorious claim but is not legally trained, (iii) Petitioner has no
23 ability to conduct discovery or investigate the facts of his case, (iv) Petitioner's helper
24 was transferred to another facility, and (v) Petitioner has no practical ability to find an
25 attorney.

26 "Indigent state prisoners applying for habeas corpus relief are not entitled to
27 appointed counsel unless the circumstances of a particular case indicate that appointed
28 counsel is necessary to prevent due process violations." *Chaney v. Lewis*, 801 F.2d

1 1191,1196 (9th Cir. 1986). However, the Court has discretion to appoint counsel when
2 “the interests of justice so require.” 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B). “In deciding whether to
3 appoint counsel in a habeas proceeding, the district court must evaluate the likelihood of
4 success on the merits as well as the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se*
5 in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952,
6 954 (9th Cir. 1983) (per curiam) (citations omitted). “Neither of these considerations is
7 dispositive and instead must be viewed together.” *Palmer v. Valdez*, 560 F.3d 965, 970
8 (9th Cir. 2009).

9 Having considered both elements, Petitioner has not shown that the interests of
10 justice require the appointment of counsel in this case. Petitioner has not demonstrated a
11 likelihood of success on the merits, nor has he shown that he is experiencing difficulty in
12 litigating this case because of the complexity of the issues involved. Petitioner’s filings
13 with the Court, as well as the instant motion, indicate that Petitioner remains capable of
14 navigating his proceedings and presenting arguments to the Court. Petitioner is in a
15 position no different than many pro se prisoner litigants. Should the Court determine that
16 an evidentiary hearing in this matter is required or counsel is necessary for the effective
17 utilization of discovery procedures, counsel may be appointed. *See* Rules 6(a) and 8(c),
18 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

19 Accordingly,

20 **IT IS ORDERED** denying Petitioner’s Motion to Request the Appointment of
21 Counsel (Doc. 8).

22 Dated this 12th day of February, 2018.

23
24 
25 _____
26 Eileen S. Willett
27 United States Magistrate Judge
28