

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

ROOSEVELT MOORE,  
Petitioner,  
v.  
KAMALA D. HARRIS, et al.,  
Respondent.

1:16 -cv-00895-JLT (HC)  
  
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL  
  
(Doc. 12)

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel, citing his lack of understanding of the law as grounds therefore. 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. In the present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of counsel at the present time. Accordingly, Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 21, 2016

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE