

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

CHICO ROMERO WATTS,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-10-0277 WBS GGH P

vs.

D. ADAMS, et al.,

Respondents.

ORDER

_____/

Petitioner has filed two motions requesting 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 May 20, 2010 and May 21, 2010 motions for appointment of counsel (Docs. 18, 19) are denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a later stage of the proceedings.

DATED: June 1, 2010

/s/ Gregory G. Hollows

GREGORY G. HOLLOWES
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

GGH:mp; watt0277.110(2)