

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

NOEL KEITH WATKINS,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-0363 WBS DAD P

vs.

MIKE KNOWLES, 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 June 1, 2010 request for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 19) is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion, if appropriate, at a later stage of the proceedings.

DATED: June 8, 2010.

DAD:md:sj
watk0363.110



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE