

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROXANNE ARI,

1:10-cv-353-AWI-JLT (HC)

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

vs.

MARY LATTIMORE,

(Doc. 14)

Respondent.

_____ /

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel, asserting simply that she is indigent and cannot afford to retain counsel. (Doc. 14). There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 889 (1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773 (8th Cir.), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 823 (1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel (Doc. 14), is DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 26, 2010

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE