IC) McBrid	e v. Cate
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	EUGENE JACOB McBRIDE,
11	Petitioner, No. CIV S-10-3387 GGH P
12	vs.
13	MATHEW CATE,
14	Respondent. <u>ORDER</u>
15	
16	Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, is proceeding with a petition for a
17	writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has filed a motion for the
18	appointment of counsel and a motion for discovery.
19	There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas
20	proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d 453, 460 (9th Cir. 1996). However, 18 U.S.C.
21	§ 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case "if the interests of justice
22	so require." See Rule 8(c), Fed. R. Governing § 2254 Cases. In the present case, the court does
23	not find that the interests of justice would be served by the appointment of counsel at the present
24	time.
25	In his motion for discovery petitioner requests the reporter's transcripts from
26	several pre-trial hearings to augment the record, but provides no specific reasons why they are

Doc. 18

needed.. The court has already ordered respondent to provide any transcripts relevant to the issues in this case with their answer. Docket No. 16. If the court requires additional transcripts, they will be requested. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 15) is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a later stage of the proceedings; and 2. Petitioner's motion for discovery (Docket No. 16) is denied. DATED: June 14, 2011 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows GREGORY G. HOLLOWS UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE GGH: AB mcbr3387.ord