(HC) Matute v. Atto	orney General, et al.
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	MAYK MATUTE, 1:09-cv-1196 DLB (HC)
12	Petitioner,
13	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	ATTORNEY GENERAL, et al.,
15	(DOCUMENT #3) Respondents.
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: July 13, 2009 /s/ Dennis L. Beck UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27	OMILD STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	

Doc. 7