(HC) Burboa v. Ca	te I
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	JUAN DEDIOS BURBOA, 1:09-cv-01694-LJO-MJS (HC)
12	Petitioner,
13	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	MATTHEW CATE,
15	[Doc. 14] Respondent.
16	
17	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no
18	absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v.
19	Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir.
20	1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel
21	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
23	interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time.
24	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment
25	of counsel is denied.
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.
27	Dated: September 20, 2010 Isl Michael J. Seng UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	UNITED STATES WAGISTRATE JUDGE

Doc. 16