(HC) Hodo v. Allison et al Doc. 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES LEE HODO,

Petitioner,

vs.

K. ALLISON, et al.,

Respondents.

_____/

1:11-cv-01555-JLT (HC)

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(Doc. 4)

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel, citing his indigence, his lack of legal experience, and the complexity of the case as grounds therefore. (Doc. 4). 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. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) 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. 4), is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: **September 16, 2011**

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dockets.Justia.com