

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
3

4 EURIE BRIM, III,

5 Petitioner,

6 v.

7 P.L. VAZQUEZ, Warden,

8 Respondent.

CASE NO. 1:17-cv-00536-SKO HC

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION  
FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(Doc. 18)

9  
10  
11 Petitioner Eurie Brim, proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28  
12 U.S.C. § 2254, moves for appointment of counsel. Petitioner contends that he requires assistance due to  
13 the complex issues in his case.

14 In federal habeas proceedings, no absolute right to appointment of counsel currently exists. *See,*  
15 *e.g., Anderson v. Heinze*, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1958); *Mitchell v. Wyrick*, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8<sup>th</sup>  
16 Cir. 1984). Nonetheless, a court may appoint counsel at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice  
17 so require." 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B); Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Petitioner  
18 has capably represented himself to this point, including his filing of a petition setting forth the same  
19 issues he now deems complex. The interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel at this  
20 advance stage of the proceedings.

21 Based on the foregoing, Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel is hereby DENIED.  
22 IT IS SO ORDERED.

23 Dated: September 22, 2017

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto  
24 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
25  
26  
27  
28