

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

THOMAS EUGENE MOORE,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-02-0007 JAM DAD P

vs.

ROBERT HOREL, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

\_\_\_\_\_/

Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d 453, 460 (9th Cir. 1996). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case “if the interests of justice so require.” See Rule 8(c), Fed. R. Governing § 2254 Cases. In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of justice would be served by the appointment of counsel at the present time.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner’s September 23, 2010, request for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 166) is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a later stage of the proceedings.

DATED: October 5, 2010.

DAD:6  
moor0007.110

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DALE A. DROZD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE