

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3

4 STEPHEN VINCENT HUNT, II,

5 Petitioner,

6 v.

7 ANDRE MATEVOUSIAN,

8 Respondents.

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

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION
FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(Doc. 26)

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 for the second time. In habeas proceedings, no absolute right
13 to appointment of counsel currently exists. *See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze*, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir.
14 1958); *Mitchell v. Wyrick*, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). Nonetheless, a court may appoint counsel
15 at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice so require." 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B); Rule 8(c),
16 Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

17 Petitioner contends that appointment of counsel is required because (1) he does not have the
18 resources necessary to file his objections; (2) he has raised at least one meritorious claim; and (3)
19 counsel could more competently present Petitioner's claim to the Court. Petitioner has already filed his
20 objections to the Court's findings and recommendations. Petitioner competently prepared and filed his
21 petition, reply, and objections; therefore, the Court finds no evidence that the interests of justice require
22 the appointment of counsel at this time.

23 Based on the foregoing, Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is hereby DENIED.

24 IT IS SO ORDERED.

25
26 Dated: October 3, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE