

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

MARTIN ROSS MIALE,

1:12-cv-1358-JLT (HC)

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

vs.

SUPERIOR COURT OF TUOLUMNE, et al,

(Doc. 5)

Respondent.

_____ /

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel, citing his lack of financial resources as grounds therefore. 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 is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 30, 2012

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE