1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
8			
9			
10	JOSE BARAJAS,	1:13 -cv-02000 AWI SKO (HC)	
11	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR	
12	v.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	
13	TIM VIRGA,	(Document#21)	
14	Respondent.		
15			
16			
17		ant of coursel. There coursetly evicts as	
18	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no		
19	absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. <u>See, e.g., Anderson v.</u>		
20	<u>Heinze</u> , 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); <u>Mitchell v. Wyrick</u> , 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir.		
21	1984). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any		
22	stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." <u>See Rule 8(c)</u> , Rules Governing		
23	Section 2254 Cases. In the present case there are numerous issues, but there is no unusual complexity, and there is no discovery pending. There are no extraordinary circumstances.		
24	The Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of coursel at the		
25	present time. By separate order the Court has granted Petitioner a lengthy extension of time		
26	in which to file a traverse.		
27	///		
28	///		
		1	

1	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment		
2	of counsel is DENIED.		
3	IT IS SO ORDERED.		
4	Dated:	August 20, 2014	/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
5			UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
			2
			-