(HC) King v. Peopl	le of the State of California D	oc. 10
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
/	LINUTED OF A THEO DIOTRICT COLUDE	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MARK KING, 1:12-cv-02058-GSA-(HC)	
12	Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR	
13	vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
14	PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, (DOCUMENT #9)	
15	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." <u>See</u> 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 4, 2013 /s/ Gary S. Austin UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
27	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE	
28		