| 1 | | |
|----|---|--------------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 6 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 7 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF GALIFORNIA | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | JOSE LUIS SANTANA, | 1:13 -cv-02034-MJS (HC) |
| 10 | Petitioner, | ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR |
| 11 | V. | APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL |
| 12 | UNKNOWN, | (Doc. 23) |
| 13 | Respondent. | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no | |
| 16 | absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. | |
| 17 | Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th | |
| 18 | Cir. 1984). However, Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of | |
| 19 | counsel at any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), | |
| 20 | Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the present case, the Court does not find that | |
| 21 | the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. | |
| 22 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of | |
| 23 | counsel is DENIED. | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 26 | Dated: <u>June 26, 2014</u> | 1st Michael J. Seng |
| 27 | | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| 28 | | |