

1

2

3

4

5

6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

7

8

9 BRENT MORRIS,

10 Petitioner,

11 vs.

12 RENEE BAKER, *et al.*,

13 Respondents.

Case No. 3:14-cv-000372-LRH-WGC

ORDER

14

15 This action is a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254
16 by a Nevada state prisoner.

17 Petitioner has filed a motion for the appointment of counsel. (ECF No. 6). Pursuant to 18
18 U.S.C. § 3006(a)(2)(B), the district court has discretion to appoint counsel when it determines that
19 the “interests of justice” require representation. There is no constitutional right to appointed counsel
20 for a federal habeas corpus proceeding. *Pennsylvania v. Finley*, 481 U.S. 551, 555 (1987); *Bonin v.*
21 *Vasquez*, 999 F.2d 425, 428 (9th Cir. 1993). The decision to appoint counsel is generally
22 discretionary. *Chaney v. Lewis*, 801 F.2d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 481 U.S. 1023
23 (1987); *Bashor v. Risley*, 730 F.2d 1228, 1234 (9th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 469 U.S. 838 (1984). The
24 petition on file in this action is well-written and sufficiently clear in presenting the issues that
25 petitioner wishes to bring. The issues in this case are not complex. Counsel is not justified in this
26 instance.

27 ///

28 ///

1 On January 29, 2015, respondents filed an answer and exhibits, and served the same on
2 petitioner. (ECF Nos. 11-16). If petitioner wishes to file a reply to the answer, he shall do so within
3 45 days from the date of entry of this order.

4 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that petitioner’s motion for the appointment of counsel
5 (ECF No. 6) is **DENIED**.

6 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, if petitioner wishes to file a reply to the answer, he
7 shall do so within **forty-five (45) days** from the date of entry of this order. Thereafter, this matter
8 will be submitted for decision.

9
10 DATED this 3rd day of February, 2015.



LARRY R. HICKS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

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