Hughes v. Marshall

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NICK R. HUGHES,

No. C 11-01185 SBA (PR)

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

v.

JOHN MARSHALL, Warden,

Respondent.

Petitioner has filed a motion for appointment of counsel in this action.

The Sixth Amendment right to counsel does not apply in habeas corpus actions. <u>See Knaubert v. Goldsmith</u>, 791 F.2d 722, 728 (9th Cir. 1986). Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B), however, authorizes a district court to appoint counsel to represent a habeas petitioner whenever "the court determines that the interests of justice so require" and such person is financially unable to obtain representation. The decision to appoint counsel is within the discretion of the district court. <u>See Chaney v. Lewis</u>, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986); <u>Knaubert</u>, 791 F.2d at 728; <u>Bashor v. Risley</u>, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir. 1984). The courts have made appointment of counsel the exception rather than the rule by limiting it to: (1) capital cases; (2) cases that turn on substantial and complex procedural, legal or mixed legal and factual questions; (3) cases involving uneducated or mentally or physically impaired petitioners; (4) cases likely to require the assistance of experts either in framing or in trying the claims; (5) cases in which petitioner is in no position to investigate crucial

Doc. 25

facts; and (6) factually complex cases. <u>See generally</u> 1 J. Liebman & R. Hertz, <u>Federal Habeas</u>
Corpus Practice and Procedure § 12.3b at 383-86 (2d ed. 1994). Appointment is mandatory only
when the circumstances of a particular case indicate that appointed counsel is necessary to prevent
due process violations. See Chaney, 801 F.2d at 1196; Eskridge v. Rhay, 345 F.2d 778, 782 (9th
Cir. 1965).
At this time, the Court is unable to determine whether the appointment of counsel is
mandated for Petitioner. Accordingly, the interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel,
and Petitioner's request is DENIED. This denial is without prejudice to the Court's <u>sua sponte</u>
reconsideration should the Court find an evidentiary hearing necessary following consideration of

This Order terminates Docket no. 24.

Dated: <u>5/13/13</u>

the merits of Petitioner's claims.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

SAUNDRA BROWN ARMSTRONG UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1	LINUTED OT A TEO DIOTRICT COLUDT	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
3	NICK R HUGHES,	
4	Case Number: CV11-01185 SBA Plaintiff,	
5	V. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	
6	JOHN MARSHALL et al,	
7	Defendant.	
8	/	
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District, Northern District of California.	rict
11	That on May 17, 2013, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing s copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing s	aid aid
12	envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle loca in the Clerk's office.	ted
13	in the clerk's office.	
14		
15	Nick R. Hughes 110 Whispering Pines Court	
16	Scotts Valley, CA 95066	
17	Dated: May 17, 2013	
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Lisa Clark, Deputy Clerk	
19	By Elou Glark, Deputy Clerk	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		