```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
                          UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 8
 9
                         CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
    JOSE CARMEN MURILL GARCIA,
                                   ) NO. CV 14-5262-PSG(E)
11
12
              Petitioner,
                                     ORDER RE "MOTION AND
13
         v.
14
    JOHN N. KATAVICH, Warden,
                                   ) DECLARATION FOR APPOINTMENT
15
              Respondent.
                                   ) OF COUNSEL"
16
17
         On July 8, 2014, Jose Carmen Murill Garcia, a state prisoner,
18
19
   filed a "Motion and Declaration For Appointment of Counsel"
20
    ("Motion"). Mr. Garcia, who has not yet filed a petition for a writ
   of habeas corpus in this Court, seeks the appointment of counsel to
21
   file such a petition. Mr. Garcia currently is serving a life sentence
22
   for first degree murder. See People v. Garcia, 223 Cal. App. 4th
23
   1173, 168 Cal. Rptr. 3d 23 (2014).
24
   ///
25
   ///
26
27
   ///
28
```

```
Unlike a capital prisoner who may commence a habeas corpus
 1
 2
    proceeding by filing a request for the appointment of counsel, a non-
    capital prisoner must initiate a habeas corpus proceeding by filing a
 3
    habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 2254.
 4
    Calderon v. United States District Court for the Northern District of
 5
    <u>California (Nicolaus</u>), 98 F.3d 1102, 1107 n.3 (9th Cir. 1996), <u>cert.</u>
 6
 7
    denied, 520 U.S. 1233 (1997); see also Mayfield v. McEwen, 2010 WL
    3955788, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 8, 2010) (non-capital prisoner could
 8
    not commence habeas proceeding by filing a motion for an order
 9
    permitting prisoner to make copies of exhibits at prison law library);
10
    <u>Sexton v. McDonald</u>, 2009 WL 3401264, at *1 (S.D. Cal. Oct. 20, 2009)
11
12
    (filing of motion to toll habeas statute of limitations did not
    initiate habeas proceeding in non-capital case). Mr. Garcia's Motion
13
14
    is insufficient to commence a habeas proceeding in this Court.
    ///
15
    ///
16
17
    ///
    ///
18
19
    ///
20
    ///
21
    ///
22
    ///
23
    ///
24
    ///
25
    ///
26
    ///
27
              See 18 U.S.C. § 3599(a)(2); McFarland v. Scott, 512
28
    U.S. 849, 856-57 (1994).
```

Accordingly, the Motion is denied and the action is dismissed without prejudice. IT IS SO ORDERED. QU 1 X Dated: July 17, 2014. PHILIP S. GUTIERREZ UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Presented this 15th day of July, 2014 by: UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE