

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

JEROME EDWARDS,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 11-3099-SAC

RAYMOND ROBERTS, et al.,

Respondents.

O R D E R

Petitioner proceeds pro se on a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and has paid the \$5.00 district court filing fee. On June 15, 2011, the court issued a show cause order, requiring respondents to file an Answer and Return. In that same order, the court denied without prejudice petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel.

Before the court is petitioner's second motion for appointment of counsel.¹ Also before the court is petitioner's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Given petitioner's payment of the district court filing fee, the court liberally construes this in forma pauperis motion as submitted in support of petitioner's renewed motion for appointment of counsel.

Petitioner basically argues the factors for appointment of

¹Petitioner titles his motion in the alternative as a motion for reconsideration (of the court's decision to deny petitioner's first motion for appointment of counsel), or as a request for "amendment" of the district court's "judgment" to deny appointment of counsel. The court finds no need to separately address these alternative requests.

counsel weigh in his favor in this case. The court is not persuaded. Petitioner's renewed request for appointment of counsel is denied.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's second motion for appointment of counsel (Doc. 4) and related motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. 5) are denied without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: This 13th day of July 2011 at Topeka, Kansas.

s/ Sam A. Crow
SAM A. CROW
U.S. Senior District Judge