

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

ARIOSTO LIRA OSORIO,

 Petitioner,

 v.

S. FRAUENHEIM,

 Respondent.

Case No. 1:17-cv-01579-EPG-HC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

(ECF No. 2)

Petitioner is proceeding *pro se* with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has filed a motion for appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 2).

There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Chaney v. Lewis, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986); Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the proceeding for financially eligible persons if “the interests of justice so require.” See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. To determine whether to appoint counsel, the “court must evaluate the likelihood of success on the merits as well as the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved.” Weygandt v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983).

Petitioner argues that counsel should be appointed because: the issues in this case are complex; he has no experience, training, or skills to deal with legal matters; and he has limited

1 English language skills that prevent him from fully utilizing the law library. (ECF No. 2 at 2–3).¹
2 Petitioner does not read or write English and relies on other inmates to assist him with
3 translation. (ECF No. 2 at 13).

4 Upon review of the petition and the instant motion for appointment of counsel, the Court
5 finds that with the assistance of fellow inmates, Petitioner appears to have a sufficient grasp of
6 his claims and the legal issues involved and that he is able to articulate those claims adequately.
7 The legal issues involved are not extremely complex, and Petitioner does not demonstrate a
8 likelihood of success on the merits such that the interests of justice require the appointment of
9 counsel at the present time.

10 If, upon review of Respondent’s response to the petition, the Court finds that the legal
11 issues are more complex than they appear currently, the Court will revisit Petitioner’s request for
12 counsel.

13 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner’s motion for appointment of
14 counsel (ECF No. 2) is DENIED without prejudice.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16
17 Dated: November 30, 2017

/s/ Eric P. Gray
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

¹ Page numbers refer to the ECF page numbers stamped at the top of the page.