UNITED S	TATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN I	DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL ALLAN YOCOM,	1:09-cv-01150-SMS (HC)
Petitioner,	
VS.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
BEN CURRY,	(DOCH DATE) (D.C.)
Respondent.	(DOCUMENT #25)
	/
Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no	
absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze,	
19 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984).	
However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage	
of the case if "the interests of justice so require." <u>See</u> 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. Accordingly, at this time, IT IS HEREBY	
ORDERED that Petitioner's request for ap	pointment of counsel is denied without prejudice.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	
Dated: September 29, 2010	/s/ Sandra M. Snyder UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	
	MICHAEL ALLAN YOCOM, Petitioner, vs. BEN CURRY, Respondent. Petitioner has requested the apportabsolute right to appointment of counsel in 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchellenth However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(1) of the case if "the interests of justice so reclaim Cases. In the present case, the Court does appointment of counsel at the present time ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of Counsel at the present time ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of Counsel at the present time ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of Counsel at the present time ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of Counsel at the present time ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of Counsel at the present time ORDERED.

Doc. 26