(HC) Espinoza v. N	McDonald I
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	CORNELIO VEDOLLA ESPINOZA, 1:10-cv-01521-LJO-SKO-(HC)
12	Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	MICK McDONALD,
15	(DOCUMENT # 34) 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. Heinze,
19	258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984).
20	However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of
21	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: November 13, 2012 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28	

Doc. 35