1		
2		
3		
<u>4</u>		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
8		
9		
10	ESTRADA VALDEZ SANTIAGO,	1:18 -cv-00398-MJS (HC)
11	Petitioner,	ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
12	٧.	APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
13	KRISTEN M. NIELSEN, et al.,	(Document#3)
14	Respondent.	
15		
16	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists	
17	no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. <u>See, e.g.,</u> <u>Anderson v. Heinze</u> , 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); <u>Mitchell v. Wyrick</u> , 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." <u>See</u> 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, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24	Petitioner's request for appointment of counsel is DENIED.	
25		
26	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
27	Dated: <u>April 14, 2018</u>	ls Michael J. Seng
28		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
		1