

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

10 RONALD MITCHELL,

11 Petitioner,

No. 2:12-cv-0780 TLN DAD P

12 vs.

13 W. 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(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 Also, petitioner has filed a request for an extension of time to file objections to the
23 court’s April 8, 2013 findings and recommendations recommending that petitioner’s application
24 for federal habeas relief be denied. Good cause appearing, that request will be granted.

25 /////

26 /////

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner's April 19, 2013, request for appointment of counsel (Docket No. 29) is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a later stage of the proceedings;
2. Petitioner's April 19, 2013, request for an extension of time (Docket No. 31) is granted; and
3. Petitioner is granted thirty days from the date of this order in which to file and serve objections to the court's April 8, 2013 findings and recommendations.

DATED: May 21, 2013.



DALE A. DROZD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:kly
mitc0780.110+111