| (HC) Mejia v. Harri | ngton I | | oc. 44 |
|---------------------|---|--|--------|
| | | | |
| | | | |
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | | |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | | |
| 7 | | | |
| 8 | UNITED | STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | | |
| 10 | <i>B</i> , 16 1 <i>B</i> x | V BIBTIMET OF CILLIFORNIT | |
| 11 | JOSHUA MICHAEL MEJIA, | 1:09-cv-01885-SMS (HC) | |
| 12 | Petitioner, | | |
| 13 | VS. | ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL | |
| 14 | HARRINGTON, | | |
| 15 | Respondent. | (DOCUMENT #36) | |
| 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. Heinze, | | |
| 19 | 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). | | |
| 20 | However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage | | |
| 21 | of the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 | | |
| 22 | Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the | | |
| 23 | appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that | | |
| 24 | Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied. | | |
| 25 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | | |
| 26 | Dated: September 20, 2010 | /s/ Sandra M. Snyder UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 27 | | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE | |
| 28 | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |