| 1 | | |
|----|--|--------------------------------|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | | |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 9 | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | NEAL O'NEILL, | No. 2:17-cv-2094 MCE AC HC |
| 12 | Petitioner, | |
| 13 | V. | <u>ORDER</u> |
| 14 | THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, | |
| 15 | Respondent. | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute | |
| 18 | right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d 453, 460 | |
| 19 | (9th Cir. 1996). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage | |
| 20 | of the case "if the interests of justice so require." See Rule 8(c), Fed. R. Governing § 2254 Cases. | |
| 21 | At this time, the court does not find that the interests of justice would be served by the | |
| 22 | appointment of counsel. | |
| 23 | Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's request for appointment of | |
| 24 | counsel (ECF No. 6) is denied without prejudice, subject to a renewal of the motion at a later | |
| 25 | stage in the proceedings. | |
| 26 | DATED: November 9, 2017 | auson Clane |
| 27 | | ALLISON CLAIRE |
| 28 | | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE |
| | | |