PAGE -1

Doc. 27

eligible individual where the "interests of justice so require" under 18 U.S.C. § 3006A. Whether counsel should be appointed turns on the petitioner's ability to articulate his or her claims in light 02 of the complexity of the legal issues, and the likelihood of success on the merits. See Weygandt 03 v. Look, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). 05 Petitioner fails to demonstrate that the legal issues are sufficiently complex to warrant 06 appointment of counsel or that the interests of justice would be best served by appointment of counsel in this matter. Furthermore, petitioner has demonstrated that he is capable of responding to the Court's Orders, as evidenced by his filing of an amended habeas petition. Accordingly, 09 petitioner's motion for appointment of counsel (Dkt. No. 23) is DENIED. 10 (2) The Clerk shall direct copies of this Order to petitioner, counsel for respondent, and to the Honorable James L. Robart. 11 12 DATED this 13th day of January, 2009. 13 14 United States Magistrate Judge 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PAGE -2