IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STEVEN MICHAEL MEDLYN,

Petitioner, No. CIV S-11-0898 DAD P

VS.

12 R. BARNES,

Respondent. <u>ORDER</u>

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

On June 29, 2011, petitioner filed a motion to proceed in forma pauperis and a motion for appointment of counsel. Petitioner has already been granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis. See Order filed April 21, 2011. Petitioner's June 29, 2011 motion to proceed in forma pauperis is unnecessary and will therefore be denied.

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, petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel will be denied.

1	Finally, on July 7, 2011, petitioner filed a motion for an extension of time to file a
2	travers. Good cause appearing, that motion will be granted.
3	In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:
4	1. Petitioner's June 29, 2011 motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. No. 18)
5	is denied as unnecessary;
6	2. Petitioner's June 29, 2011 motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 19) is
7	denied;
8	3. Petitioner's July 7, 2011 motion for extension of time (Doc. No. 20) is granted;
9	and
10	4. Petitioner shall file and serve a traverse within thirty days from the date of this
11	order.
12	DATED: July 14, 2011.
13	2 2 .
14	DALE A. DROZD
15	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
16	
17	
18	
19	DAD:12:mp medl0898.111
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	