

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

HAROLD B. WILSON,)	8:14CV152
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	MEMORANDUM
)	AND ORDER
MARIO PEART,)	
)	
Respondent.)	

This matter is before the court on Petitioner Harold Wilson’s Motion for Appointment of Counsel (Filing No. [16](#)) and Motion for Enlargement of Time (Filing No. [18](#)).

“[T]here is neither a constitutional nor statutory right to counsel in habeas proceedings; instead, [appointment] is committed to the discretion of the trial court.” [McCall v. Benson, 114 F.3d 754, 756 \(8th Cir. 1997\)](#). As a general rule, counsel will not be appointed unless the case is unusually complex or the petitioner’s ability to investigate and articulate the claims is unusually impaired or an evidentiary hearing is required. *See, e.g., Morris v. Dormire, 217 F.3d 556, 558-59 (8th Cir. 2000), cert. denied, 531 U.S. 984 (2000); Hoggard v. Purkett, 29 F.3d 469, 471 (8th Cir. 1994)*. *See also* Rule 8(c) of the *Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts* (requiring appointment of counsel if an evidentiary hearing is warranted). The court has carefully reviewed the record and finds there is no need for the appointment of counsel at this time. The court will, however, grant Petitioner an extension of time in which to respond to Respondent’s summary judgment motion.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that:

1. Petitioner’s Motion to Appoint Counsel (Filing No. [16](#)) is denied without prejudice to reassertion.

2. Petitioner's Motion for Enlargement of Time (Filing No. [18](#)) is granted. Petitioner's response to the summary judgment motion is due May 25, 2015.

3. Respondent's Objection (Filing No. [20](#)) to Petitioner's Motion to Appoint Counsel is sustained.

DATED this 2nd day of March, 2015.

BY THE COURT:

s/ Joseph F. Bataillon
Senior United States District Judge

*This opinion may contain hyperlinks to other documents or Web sites. The U.S. District Court for the District of Nebraska does not endorse, recommend, approve, or guarantee any third parties or the services or products they provide on their Web sites. Likewise, the court has no agreements with any of these third parties or their Web sites. The court accepts no responsibility for the availability or functionality of any hyperlink. Thus, the fact that a hyperlink ceases to work or directs the user to some other site does not affect the opinion of the court.