

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

JEREMY THOMAS CLARK,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-08-2949 LKK DAD P

vs.

MIKE MARTEL,

Respondent.

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 June 17, 2009 motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 19) is denied.

DATED: July 1, 2009.

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

DAD:9:mp  
clar2949.110