1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	RAMON NAVARRO LUPERCIO, 1:08-cv-00012-LJO-JLT (HC)
12	Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	SYLVIA GONZALEZ, (Doc. 26)
15	Respondent.
16	/
17	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel, contending simply that he cannot
18	afford to hire an attorney. (Doc. 26). There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of
19	counsel in habeas proceedings. See e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir.), cert.
20	denied, 358 U.S. 889 (1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S.
21	823 (1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage
22	of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254
23	Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the
24	appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that
25	petitioner's request for appointment of counsel (Doc. 26), is DENIED.
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.
27	Dated:May 26, 2010/s/ Jennifer L. ThurstonUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	