| 1        |   |
|----------|---|
| 2        |   |
| 3        |   |
| 4        |   |
| 5        | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |
| 6        | DISTRICT OF NEVADA  |
| 7        |   |
| 8        | JESSICA BARRAZA,  |
| 9        | Petitioner, 2:14-cv-01185-APG-PAL   |
| 10       | vs. ORDER   |
| 11       | J. GENTRY, et al.,  |
| 12       | Respondents.  |
| 13       | /   |
| 14       |   |
| 15       | In this habeas corpus action, the respondents filed a motion to dismiss on July 14, 2015                  |
| 16       | (ECF No. 10).   |
| 17       | On July 27, 2015, the petitioner, Jessica Barraza, filed three motions: a motion for                      |
| 18       | appointment of counsel (ECF No. 13), a motion for an extension of time to respond to the motion to        |
| 19<br>20 | dismiss (ECF No. 14), and a motion for stay (ECF No. 15) requesting that she not be required to           |
| 20       | respond to the motion to dismiss until the motion for appointment of counsel and the motion for           |
| 21       | extension of time are resolved.   |
| 22       | "Indigent state prisoners applying for habeas corpus relief are not entitled to appointed                 |
| 23       | counsel unless the circumstances of a particular case indicate that appointed counsel is necessary to     |
| 24<br>25 | prevent due process violations." <i>Chaney v. Lewis</i> , 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir.1986) (citing      |
| 25<br>26 | <i>Kreiling v. Field</i> , 431 F.2d 638, 640 (9th Cir.1970) (per curiam). The court may, however, appoint |
| 26       | counsel at any stage of the proceedings "if the interests of justice so require." See 18 U.S.C.           |

\$ 3006A; see also Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District
 Courts; *Chaney*, 801 F.2d at 1196. The court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted in
 this case. The motion for appointment of counsel will be denied.

The court will grant Barraza's motion for an extension of time to respond to the motion to dismiss, albeit not for the length of time she requests. Barraza's response to the motion to dismiss is currently due on August 31, 2015. *See* Order entered June 2, 2015 (ECF No. 9). The court will extend that deadline to grant Barraza an extension of time to November 20, 2015. After Barraza responds to the motion to dismiss, respondents will have 30 days to file a reply in support of the motion to dismiss. *See id*. The court will not look favorably upon any motion to further extend either of these deadlines.

The resolutions of the motion for appointment of counsel and the motion for extension oftime render moot the motion for stay, and the court will deny that motion on that ground.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner's Motion to Appoint Counsel (ECF No.
14 13) is DENIED.

15 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion for extension of time (ECF No. 14)
16 is GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART. Petitioner shall have until and including
17 November 20, 2015 to respond to the motion to dismiss.

18 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that petitioner's motion for stay (ECF No. 15) is DENIED as
19 moot.

Dated: August 4, 2015.

21 22

23

24

25

26

20

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

2