Doc. 27 (HC) Rosiles v. Pfeiffer 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 FRANK RENE ROSILES, No. 2:17-cv-2600 KJM GGH P 12 Petitioner, 13 **ORDER** v. 14 C. PFEIFFER, 15 Respondent. 16 17 Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d 453, 460 18 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 In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of justice would be served by the 22 appointment of counsel at the present time. 23 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner's request for appointment of counsel (ECF No. 26) is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a later stage of the 24 25 proceedings. 26 Dated: January 11, 2019 /s/ Gregory G. Hollows 27 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 28 1