

1
2 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
3 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4

5 KAREEM MUHAMMAD,

6 Petitioner,

7 v.

8 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9 AND T.R. MERICKEL,

10 Respondents.

CASE NO. 1:15-cv-00794-BAM HC

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION
FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(Doc. 13)

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

18 In the above-captioned case, the Court finds no evidence that the interests of justice require the
19 appointment of counsel at this time. Accordingly, the Court hereby DENIES Petitioner's motion for
20 appointment of counsel.

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22
23 Dated: November 24, 2015

/s/ Barbara A. McAuliffe
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE