1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9	ROGER ROBERTSON,	1:14 -cv-00924-AWI-MJS (HC)
10	Petitioner,	1111 00 000217001 0000 (110)
11	V.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
12	MARIPOSA COUNTY COURT, et al,	(Doc. 32)
13	Respondent.	(2 5 5 6 5 2)
14	rtoopondont.	
15		
16	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no	
17	absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v.	
18	Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th	
	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	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
25	TI IO OO ORDERED.	
26	Dated: September 29, 2014	1st Michael J. Seng
27		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
28		