

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 JOHN DOUGLAS WHITE,

11 Petitioner,

No. 2:11-cv-03016 TLN DAD P

12 vs.

13 WILLIAM KNIPP,

14 Respondent.

ORDER

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©), 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 Also, petitioner has filed his second request for an extension of time to file a  
23 traverse. Good cause appearing, the request will be granted. No further extensions of time will  
24 be granted for this purpose.

25 /////

26 /////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner's April 25, 2013, request for appointment of counsel (Doc. No. 23) is denied without prejudice;

2. Petitioner's April 25, 2013 request for an extension of time (Doc. No. 22) is granted; and

3. Petitioner is granted thirty days from the date of service of this order in which to file and serve a traverse. However, no further extensions of time will be granted for this purpose.

DATED: May 1, 2013.

  
DALE A. DROZD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD: md/4  
whit3016.110+111.sec