

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

TIMOTHY CORONADO,

1:11-cv-01960-BAM (HC)

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER’S MOTION  
FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

v.

[Doc. 4]

A. BITER,

Respondent.

Petitioner is proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. On November 28, 2011, Petitioner filed a motion for the appointment of counsel.

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 (8th Cir. 1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A 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 would be served by the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, petitioner’s request for appointment of counsel is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**Dated: December 9, 2011**

**/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe**  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE