(HC) Singh v. Martel		
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	ASHMINDAR JEET SINGH,	
11	Petitioner, No. Cl	IV S-09-1453 GEB GGH P
12	VS.	
13	MICHAEL MARTEL,	
14	Respondent. ORDE	<u>ER</u>
15	/	
16	Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no	
17	absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d	
18	453, 460 (9th Cir. 1996). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at	
19	any stage of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Fed. R. Governing	
20	§ 2254 Cases. In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of justice would be	
21	served by the appointment of counsel at the present time.	
22	Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's May 7, 2010 request	
23	for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 18) is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the	
24	motion at a later stage of the proceedings.	
25	DATED: May 17, 2010	/s/ Gregory G. Hollows
26		UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
	GGH:md - sing1453.110	OMILD SIMILS MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Doc. 19