I

1	
2	
3	
4	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
6	
7	DENNIS THOMAS, 1:09-cv-02252-LJO-MJS (HC)
8	Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
9	vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
10	JAMES HARTLEY, Warden, (Doc. 26)
11	Respondent.
12	/
13	On September 29, 2011 Petitioner filed a request for a form to fill out to request the
14	appointment of counsel. Liberally construing the request, the Court shall consider the filing as
15	a motion for the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute right to
16	appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479,
17	481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, Title 18
18	U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the
19	interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the
20	present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of
21	counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request
22	for appointment of counsel is denied.
23	
24	IT IS SO ORDERED.
25	Dated: <u>November 2, 2011</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26	
27	
28	