

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 RICK DESHON,

12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 A. KAESTNER and JEFFREY BEARD,

15 Respondents.  
16

No. 2:14-cv-509-JAM-EFB P

ORDER

17 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding without counsel, has filed an application for a writ  
18 of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He has requested that the court appoint counsel  
19 and that the court recognize inmate William Thornton as his “next friend.” As explained below,  
20 both requests are denied.

21 There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings.  
22 *See Nevius v. Sumner*, 105 F.3d 453, 460 (9th Cir. 1996). The court may appoint counsel at any  
23 stage of the proceedings “if the interests of justice so require.” *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3006A; *see also*,  
24 Rule 8(c), Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. The court does not find that the interests of justice  
25 would be served by the appointment of counsel at this stage of the proceedings.

26 Petitioner also requests that Mr. Thornton be recognized as petitioner’s “next friend.” A  
27 “next friend” must be “truly dedicated to the best interests of the person on whose behalf he seeks  
28 to litigate, . . . and it has been further suggested that a ‘next friend’ must have some significant

1 relationship with the real party in interest.” *Whitmore v. Arkansas*, 495 U.S. 149, 163-64 (1990).  
2 Here, there is no indication that petitioner and Mr. Thornton have the type of relationship to allow  
3 for Mr. Thornton’s standing as “next friend.”

4 Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that petitioner’s request for appointment of counsel  
5 and for “next friend” standing (ECF Nos. 26, 28) are denied.

6 Dated: March 25, 2015.

7   
8 EDMUND F. BRENNAN  
9 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28