(HC) Garcia v. Virg	ga I
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	Enterent District of Chem ordan
11	PAUL CARLOS GARCIA, 1:13-cv-448-SKO (HC)
12	Petitioner,
13	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	TIM VIRGA,
15	(DOCUMENT #21) Respondent.
16	Kespondent.
17	Datitionar has requested the appointment of council. There surrently exists no
	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, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of
21	the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254
22	Cases. In the present case, in view of the number and nature of issues, the Court does not find
23	that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly,
24	IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is denied.
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.
26	Dated: June 24, 2013 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
27	
28	

Doc. 22