

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Bolin v. Newcomb

Bolin · No. 2:25-cv-1497 DC SCR P · Decided August 1, 2025

OPINION

(HC) Bolin v. Newcomb

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11 PAUL C. BOLIN, No. 2:25-cv-1497 DC SCR P

12 Petitioner, 13 v. ORDER 14 RACHAEL NEWCOMB, et al., 15 Respondents. 16 17 Petitioner
has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute 18 right to
appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings. See Nevius v. Sumner, 105 F.3d 453, 460 19 (9th
Cir. 1996). However, 18 U.S.C. § 3006A authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage 20 of
the case “if the interests of justice so require.” See Rule 8(c), Fed. R. Governing § 2254 Cases. 21
In the present case, the court does not find that the interests of justice would be served by the 22
appointment of counsel at the present time. 23 //// 24 //// 25 //// 26 //// 27 //// 28 ////] Accordingly,
IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that petitioner’s request for appointment of 2 || counsel (ECF No. 6)
is denied without prejudice to a renewal of the motion at a later stage of the 3 || proceedings. 4 |

DATED: August 1, 2025 mk

SEAN C. RIORDAN

7 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28