(HC) Arellano v. Til	ilton De	oc. 27
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	JOHNNY ARRELLANO, 1:07-cv-01597-OWW-WMW (HC)	
12	Petitioner,	
13	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
14	JAMES E. TILTON,	
15	(DOCUMENT #26) Respondent.	
16		
17	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute	
18	right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d	
19	479, 481 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 889 (1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773 (8th Cir.),	
20	cert. denied, 469 U.S. 823 (1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment	
21	of counsel at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules	
22	Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of	
23	justice would be served by the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS	
24	HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied.	
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
26	Dated: January 29, 2009 /s/ William M. Wunderlich UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
27	OMILD STATES WAGISTRATE JUDGE	
28		