1		
1		
2		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	VALDO C. OROZCO,	1:10-cv-01599-MJS (HC)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	V.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	KELLY HARRINGTON,	(Doc. 32)
15	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.	
19	Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir.	
20	1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel	
21	at any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules	
22	Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the	
23	interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at this time. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied.	
24 25	HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for	appointment of counsel is denied.
25 26	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
20 27		Michael I. Sona
27	Dated: <u>March 14, 2012</u> /s/ // UNITED STA	<u>Michael J. Seng</u> ATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
20		
	u	