

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM ROBERT STANKEWITZ,

1:06-cv-01220-LJO-JLT (HC)

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

vs.

DERRAL G. ADAMS,

(DOCUMENT #30)

Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. (Doc. 30). There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 889 (1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 823 (1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Indeed, the case is presently in administrative closure and a stay of proceedings is in effect. Petitioner provides no specific reasons why Petitioner requires the services of an attorney for a case presently.

///  
///  
///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of  
counsel (Doc. 30), is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 10, 2010

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE