

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Vladimirovich v. Giles

No. 1:25-cv-00953-SKO (HC) (E.D. Cal. Aug. 6, 2025) · No. 1:25-cv-00953-SKO (HC) · Decided August 7,
2025

OPINION

(HC) Vladimirovich v. Giles

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 11 MELNYK O. VLADIMIROVICH, Case No. 1:25-cv-00953-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

13 v. [Doc. 2] 14 THOMAS GILES, 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, e.g., *Anderson v. Heinze*, 258 F.2d 19 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); *Mitchell*
v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, Title 20 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B)
authorizes the appointment of counsel at any stage of the case if "the 21 interests of justice so
require." See Rule 8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In the 22 present case, the Court
does not find that the interests of justice require the appointment of 23 counsel at the present time.
24 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of 25
counsel is DENIED. 26 IT IS SO ORDERED. 27 Dated: August 6, 2025 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto .

1 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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