

1 I denied Green's first two requests for counsel because I found that the issues in this case
2 are not so complex that denial of counsel would amount to a denial of due process, and because I
3 found that Green's petition is well-written and sufficiently presents the issues that Green wishes
4 to bring.⁸ Green has given me no valid reason to depart from my previous findings, and I do not
5 find that the arguments raised in respondents' 13-page motion to dismiss are so extensive or
6 complicated to justify appointment of counsel.⁹ I therefore deny Green's third request for court-
7 appointed counsel and his motion for stay pending appointment of counsel.

8 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Green's Renewed Motion for Appointment of
9 Counsel (**Dkt. #28**) is **DENIED**, and Green's Motion to Stay Proceedings (**Dkt. #29**) is
10 **DENIED**.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Green's Motion for Ruling (**Dkt. #33**) is **DENIED** as
12 **moot**.

13 DATED this 29th day of March, 2016.



14
15 ANDREW P. GORDON
16 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 ⁸ (Dkt. #7 at 1 (denying Green's first and second request for counsel, Dkt. #2, #4).)

27 ⁹ For example, respondents argue that Green's petition contains unexhausted claims. (Dkt. #14 at
28 6.) Exhaustion is raised in defense to many habeas petitions and does not require appointment of counsel.