

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

3  
4 STEPHEN VINCENT HUNT, II,

5 Petitioner,

6 v.

7 ANDRE MATEVOUSIAN,

8 Respondent.

CASE NO. 1:15-cv-00165-LJO-SKO HC

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION  
FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(Doc. 20)

9  
10  
11 Petitioner, proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C.  
12 § 2241, moves for appointment of counsel. In habeas proceedings, no absolute right to appointment of  
13 counsel currently exists. *See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze*, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1958); *Mitchell v.*  
14 *Wyrick*, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1984). Nonetheless, a court may appoint counsel at any stage of the  
15 case "if the interests of justice so require." 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B); Rule 8(c), Rules Governing  
16 Section 2254 Cases.

17 Petitioner contends that appointment of counsel is required since (1) he is indigent; (2) he has  
18 raised at least one meritorious claim; and (3) counsel could more skillfully present Petitioner's claim to  
19 the Court. The answer and reply (traverse) in this case have already been filed, however. Petitioner  
20 competently prepared and filed his petition and reply. Accordingly, the Court finds no evidence that the  
21 interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at this time.

22 Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is hereby DENIED.

23 IT IS SO ORDERED.

24 Dated: March 29, 2016

25 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
26 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE