

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MARIO ARCIGA,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
SCOTT FRAUENHEIM,  
Respondent.

1:15 -cv-01372-JLT (HC)  
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL  
(Doc. 3)

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel on the grounds that his case is complicated and he is unfamiliar with the law. There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. *See, e.g., Anderson v. 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 counsel at any stage of the case if "the interests of justice so require." *See* Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Here, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at this time. Accordingly, Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: September 9, 2015

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28