

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

STEPHEN A. BLAISDELL,)
)
 Petitioner,)
)
 vs.)
)
 HOWARD SKOLNIK, *et al.*,)
)
 Respondents.)
)
 _____)
)

3:08-cv-00094-LRH-VPC
ORDER

Before the court is petitioner’s second motion for appointment of counsel (dkt # 29) and respondents’ second motion for enlargement of time in which to file an answer (dkt #30).

Petitioner argues that his circumstances have changed significantly to justify the court’s reconsideration of appointing counsel to assist him, citing a move to the Warm Springs Correctional Center and the condition of its law library. Petitioner’s prior pleadings and even the instant motion suggest petitioner’s skills and education will allow him to continue to represent himself effectively in this matter. Because there is no constitutional right to counsel in habeas corpus actions, the law supports this decision. *See Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); *Bonin v. Vasquez*, 999 F.2d 425, 428 (9th Cir. 1993).

Respondents seek an additional 45 days to prepare and file their Answer to the remaining claims of the petition. The motion shall be granted, but in light of the history of this action, no further enlargements of time will be granted absent a showing of extraordinary circumstances.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that petitioner’s motion (dkt #29) is **DENIED**.
IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that respondents’ motion (dkt #30) is **GRANTED**.

1 Respondents shall have up to and including March 25, 2010, in which to file their Answer. No
2 further enlargements of time for this purpose shall be granted absent a showing of extraordinary
3 circumstances.

4 DATED this 8th day of February, 2010.



7
8 LARRY R. HICKS
9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28