IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

U

_ .

JOHN SHAW aka JOHN HSIA,

Petitioner,

v.

TIM PEREZ, Acting Warden,

Respondent.

No. C 13-1739 CW (PR)

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S
MOTIONS TO PROCEED IFP ON
APPEAL, TO APPOINT COUNSEL ON
APPEAL AND FOR RELIEF FROM
JUDGMENT

Doc. Nos. 26, 27 and 31

On January 16, 2014, this Court issued an Order Granting Respondent's Motion to Dismiss this petition based on untimeliness. On the same day, judgment was entered in favor of Respondent. On February 3, 2014, Petitioner filed a notice of appeal. On February 7, 2014, the Ninth Circuit filed a notice that it had received Petitioner's notice of appeal and assigned it case number 14-15231. Doc. no. 29. Also, on February 3, 2014, Petitioner filed motions for leave to appeal in forma pauperis (IFP) and for appointment of counsel on appeal. On February 10, 2014, Petitioner filed a motion for relief from the judgment filed on January 16, 2014.

Under Rule 24(a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Appellate

Procedure, Petitioner's request to proceed IFP on appeal is

DENIED. Although he states that he is unable to pay the filing

fee because of his poverty, he does not attach an affidavit that

"shows in detail prescribed by Form 4 of the Appendix of Forms the

party's inability to pay or to give security for fees and costs."

15 ll

Fed. R. App. P. 24(a)(1)(A). Because Petitioner paid the filing fee when his case was before the district court, <u>see</u> doc. no. 6, he has not previously been granted IFP status and, thus, Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 24(a)(3) does not apply.

The Sixth Amendment's right to counsel does not apply in habeas corpus actions. Knaubert v. Goldsmith, 791 F.2d 722, 728 (9th Cir. 1986). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) provides that in habeas cases, whenever "the court determines that the interests of justice so require, representation may be provided for any financially eligible person . . . " Petitioner's claims are not particularly complex. The interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel. The motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED.

Plaintiff's motion for relief from judgment is DENIED.

Because the motion was filed after the filing of a notice of appeal, the Court lacks jurisdiction to consider the motion, see Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc. v. Southwest Marine Inc., 242 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2001) (once notice of appeal is filed, district court loses jurisdiction), and the Court is not disposed to entertain the motion, so the Court of Appeals need not remand for ruling, see Williams v. Woodford, 384 F.3d 567, 586 (9th Cir. 2002).

Based on the foregoing, the Court orders as follows:

- 1. Plaintiff's motion to proceed IFP on appeal is denied.
- 25 | Doc. no. 26.
 - 2. Plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel on appeal is denied. Doc. no. 27.

For the Northern District of California **United States District Court**

1	
2	Doc
3	
4	the
5	
6	
7	Dat
8	
9	
10	cc:
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
20212223	
24	
242526	
26	

27

28

	3.	Plaintiff'	S	motion	for	relief	from	judgment	is	denied
_	no.	. 31.								

4. The Clerk of the Court shall mail a copy of this Order to ne Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ated: 2/12/2014

United States District Judge

c: NC