1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7	EASTERN DIST	RICT OF CALIFORNIA
8		
9	SAMUEL XAVIER BRYANT,	1:16-cv-00190-MJS (HC)
10	Petitioner,	ODDED DENVING MOTION FOR
11	V.	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
12	W. MUNIZ,	(Doc. 11)
13	Respondent.	
14		
15	Petitioner has requested the ann	ointment of counsel. There currently exists no
16	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v.	
17	Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th	
18	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		
25	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
26	Datada Moreh O 2040	101 M. l. l. P. P.
27	Dated: <u>March 9, 2016</u>	<u>ISI Michael J. Seng</u> UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE