|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 13, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Paul Gilbert |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Stermitz | Prosecutor(s) | Ric Casper and Heidi Remick  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 4 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Status Hearings | | |
| **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?**  Matt appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Matt appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Matt did a good job advocating for his 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 Matt’s has a felony case already in District Court scheduled for Jury Trial next week. This misdemeanor case was continued to 12/11/2024 for a status hearing following the jury trial. * One of Matt’s clients waived his right to a speedy preliminary hearing and the case was continued to 12/11/2024 to enable the parties to continue to work on a possible settlement of the case. * One of Matt’s clients cases was continued by stipulation to 1/15/2025. The client was out of custody. No explanation was made in open court regarding the reason for the continuance. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Matt’s clients accepted a settlement offer from the State. The client waived his right to a preliminary hearing. The case was bound over to District Court and scheduled for an Arraignment on 12/16/2025.