| 1 | | |
|----|---|---|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | JOAQUIN FLORES, | Case No. 1:24-cv-00444-SKO (HC) |
| 12 | Petitioner, | ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL |
| 13 | v. | [Doc. 5] |
| 14 | THE PEOPLE, | [200.0] |
| 15 | Respondent. | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute | |
| 18 | right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d | |
| 19 | 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, Title | |
| 20 | 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the | |
| 21 | interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the | |
| 22 | present case, the Court does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of | |
| 23 | counsel at the present time. | |
| 24 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of | |
| 25 | counsel is DENIED. | |
| 26 | IT IS SO ORDERED | |
| 27 | IT IS SO ORDERED. | |
| 28 | Dated: May 7, 2024 | /s/ Sheila K. Oberto |

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE