1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	JOSE ONTIVEROS SEPULVEDA, 1:13-cv-723 JLT (HC)
12	Petitioner, ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
13	vs. APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
14	GERY SWARTHOUT, (Doc. 13)
15	Respondent.
16	/
17	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel, arguing that he needs appointed
18	counsel because his "jailhouse" lawyer is being transferred to another facility. There currently
19	exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson
20	v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir.
21	1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at
22	any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing
23	Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice
24	require the appointment of counsel at the present time. The petition has been filed, screened,
25	and found to raise arguable federal habeas issues; an Answer on the merits has been filed; and
26	the only remaining task is the filing of a Traverse, should Petitioner choose to file one.
27	Otherwise, a decision on the merits of the case will be made based on the legal arguments
28	already framed in the petition and the documents, transcripts and court records supplied by

1	Respondent in the Answer. The Court normally does not consider new claims raised for the
2	first time in a Traverse. Therefore, appointment of counsel would at this juncture would do
3	little to further the litigation or preserve Petitioner's rights.
4	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of
5	counsel is denied.
6	
7	
8	IT IS SO ORDERED.
9	Dated:August 14, 2013/s/ Jennifer L. ThurstonUNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
20	
21	
22	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	2