| (HC) Trice v. McDo | onald<br>I  |
|--------------------|---|
|                    |   |
|                    |   |
| 1                  |   |
| 2                  |   |
| 3                  |   |
| 4                  |   |
| 5                  |   |
| 6                  |   |
| 7                  |   |
| 8                  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
| 9                  | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |
| 10                 |   |
| 11                 | KEVIN LAQUAN TRICE, 1:11-cv-0951-SKO (HC)   |
| 12                 | Petitioner,   |
| 13                 | ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL   |
| 14                 | M. MCDONALD,  |
| 15                 | (DOCUMENT #3) 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: June 13, 2011 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto   |
| 27                 | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |
| 28                 |   |
|                    |   |

Doc. 8