

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

10 MATTHEW Q SHOOP,  
11  
12 Petitioner,

13 v.

14 DONALD HOLBROOK,  
Respondent.

CASE NO. 3:15-CV-05868-RBL-DWC

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR  
APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

15  
16 The District Court has referred this action filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 to United States  
17 Magistrate Judge David W. Christel. Currently pending in this action is Petitioner's Motion for  
18 Appointment of Counsel. Dkt. 6.

19 There is no right appointed counsel in cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 unless an  
20 evidentiary hearing is required or such appointment is "necessary for the effective utilization of  
21 discovery procedures." *See McCleskey v. Zant*, 499 U.S. 467, 495 (1991); *United States v.*  
22 *Duarte-Higareda*, 68 F.3d 369, 370 (9th Cir. 1995); *United States v. Angelone*, 894 F.2d 1129,  
23 1130 (9th Cir. 1990); *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983); Rules Governing  
24 Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts 6(a) and 8(c). The Court may appoint

1 counsel“at any stage of the case if the interest of justice so require.” *Weygandt*, 718 F.2d at 754.

2 In deciding whether to appoint counsel, the Court“must evaluate the likelihood of success on the  
3 merits as well as the ability of the petitioner to articulate his claims pro se in light of the  
4 complexity of the legal issues involved.” *Id.*

5 Here, the Court directed service of the Petition and the time for filing an answer has not  
6 run. *See* Dkt. 5. As an answer has not been filed, the Court does not find good cause for granting  
7 leave to conduct discovery and has not determined an evidentiary hearing will be required. *See*  
8 Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts 6(a) and 8(c).  
9 Furthermore, Petitioner effectively articulated his grounds for relief raised in the Petition, the  
10 grounds are not factually or legally complex, and it is difficult to determine the likelihood of  
11 success on the merits without an answer and the state court record. *See* Dkt. 4. Thus, Petitioner  
12 has not shown the interest of justice requires the Court to appoint counsel at this stage in the  
13 case.

14 As Petitioner has not shown appointment of counsel is appropriate at this time, the  
15 Motion for the Appointment of Counsel is denied without prejudice.

16 Dated this 6th day of January, 2016.

17 

18 David W. Christel  
19 United States Magistrate Judge