(HC) Gil v. Yates	t al		Doc.	14
				1
				1
1				Ì
2				Ì
3				Î.
4				1
5				1
6				1
7				1
8	U	INITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		Ī
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			1
10				Î.
11	FRANCISCO GIL,	1:09-cv-1706-MJS (HC)		Ī
12	Petitioner,			1
13	VS.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL		1
14	JAMES A. YATES,			1
15	Respondent.	[Doc. 13]		1
16		/		1
17	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute			Ī
18	right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d			1
19	479, 481 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 889 (1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773 (8th Cir.),			1
20	cert. denied, 469 U.S. 823 (1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment			1
21	of counsel at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules			1
22	Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of			1
23	justice would be served by the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS			1
24	HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied.			1
25				Ī
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.			1
27	Dated: <u>May 19, 2010</u>	/s/ Michael J. Seng UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		Ī
28		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE		Ī
				Ì