|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | October 23, 2024 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Union Justice Court | Judge | Jim Loveless |
| Defense Attorney | Debra Amens | Prosecutor(s) | Anthony Gordon, Aaron Russell, and Elizabeth Evans,  Deputy District Attorneys |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 2 clients (3 cases) |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Pretrial Conferences, Preliminary Hearing, and Review Hearing | | |
| **Attorney's Preparedness** | | | |
| Did the Attorney appear for court? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney have the file? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney appear to have had a substantive, confidential meeting with  each client before court? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney appear prepared to handle their clients' cases? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **How prepared did the Attorney appear?**  Debra appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Debra appeared to be knowledgeable about her cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Debra did a good job advocating for her clients during the court hearing. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good. | | | |
| **Case Stage-Specific Issues** | | | |
| Did the Attorney argue for pretrial release/OR, or for reasonable bail? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney counsel each client to refrain from waiving trial rights until the  attorney completed investigation of the case? | | | Yes / No / Unknown |
| Did the Attorney appear to have counseled clients to refrain from waiving any  rights at arraignment? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney appear to adequately advise clients of the consequences of  accepting a plea or going to trial, including any collateral consequences? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney present mitigating evidence and provide argument at  sentencing? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney address the Presentence Investigation Report (PSI) and/or  Psychosexual Evaluation/Risk Assessment appropriately? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the court require defendant(s) to reimburse the entity for representation? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **Overall Assessments** | | | |
| Does the Attorney appear to have a sustainable workload? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Overall, does the Attorney appear to be providing effective representation to  their clients? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continue on reverse):**   * One of Debra’s clients was in custody. He had two cases pending.  1. One of his cases was a preliminary hearing on a Sexual Assault on a Child Under the Age of 16 Years. The State called 3 witnesses: the victim and two police officers. Debra did a good job cross-examining all 3 witnesses. At the conclusion of the evidentiary hearing and prior to the case being transferred to District Court, Debra argued for a reduction of the bail. The State opposed the bail to be lowered. The court | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

lowered the bail from $250,000 to $10,000 cash or bond.

1. This client had a second case that was set for a review hearing today. No resolution was reached. The parties requested that this case be set for a pretrial conference in January. The court set the pretrial conference on January 15, 2025.

* Debra’s remaining client was out of custody and scheduled for a Pretrial Conference. This client was permitted to appear by Zoom. Unfortunately, the client did not appear by Zoom or in person. Debra waived the client’s right to a speedy preliminary hearing and the case was set for a preliminary hearing on December 2, 2024.