

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Abdullo Idiev v. Warden, Golden State Annex Detention Facility, et
al.

Idiev · No. 1:25-cv-01778-SKO (HC) · Decided December 17, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California denied Abdullo Idiev's request for appointment of counsel in his habeas proceeding. The court held that there is no absolute right to appointed counsel in habeas proceedings and that the interests of justice did not currently require appointment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	December 17, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-01778-SKO (HC)
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought appointment of counsel in a federal habeas proceeding.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished
PARTIES	Abdullo Idiev v. Warden, Golden State Annex Detention Facility, et al.

TOPICS

- [federal habeas corpus](#) [post-conviction relief](#) [civil procedure](#)

PRACTICE AREAS

- [federal habeas corpus](#) [post-conviction relief](#)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should appoint counsel for the petitioner in the habeas proceeding.

HOLDINGS

1. There is no absolute right to appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings, and counsel should not be appointed at this stage because the interests of justice did not require it.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The petitioner requested appointment of counsel in connection with his habeas proceeding. The court determined that no absolute right to appointed counsel exists in habeas proceedings and that the interests of justice did not presently require counsel.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Abdullo Idiev filed a habeas petition and requested appointment of counsel. The district court denied the request because it did not find that the interests of justice required appointment of counsel at that time.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958)
- Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d 773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 ABDULLO IDIEV, Case No. 1:25-cv-01778-SKO (HC) 12 Petitioner,
ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL 13 v. [Doc. 3] 14
WARDEN, GOLDEN STATE ANNEX DETENTION FACILITY, et al., 15 Respondents. 16 17 18
Petitioner has requested the appointment of counsel. There currently exists no absolute 19 right to
appointment of counsel in habeas proceedings.

See, e.g., Anderson v. Heinze, 258 F.2d 20 479, 481 (9th Cir. 1958); Mitchell v. Wyrick, 727 F.2d
773, 774 (8th Cir. 1984). However, 21 Title 18 U.S.C. § 3006A(a)(2)(B) authorizes the
appointment of counsel at any stage of the case 22 if "the interests of justice so require." See Rule
8(c), Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. At 23 the present time, the Court does not find that the
interests of justice require the appointment of 24 counsel.

25 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioner's request for appointment of 26
counsel is DENIED. 27 IT IS SO ORDERED. 1 Dated: December 17, 2025 /s/ Sheila K. Oberto. 2
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 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

