(HC) Lucero v. Mc	Donald I
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	ALBERT ANDREW LUCERO, 1:10-cv-01714-AWI-SKO (HC)
12	Petitioner,
13	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	MIKE D. McDONALD,
15	(DOCUMENT #31) 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, 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: February 2, 2012 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27	UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDGE
28	

Doc. 33