|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | December 23, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept II | Judge | Thomas Gregory |
| Defense Attorney | Max Stovall | Prosecutor(s) | Ric Casper  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 2 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 2 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Hearing on Motion for Competency Evaluation and Sentencing 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?**  Max appeared to be prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Max appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Good. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good. Although I could not determine how well Matt’s client (to be evaluated for competency) understands the communications. | | | |
| **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 / Unknown |
| 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 / Unknown |
| 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:**   * One of Max’s clients was in court on a Motion for Competency Determination. The State did not oppose the motion. The court ordered the evaluations by 2 qualified psychologists. The client stated initially to the court that he did not want to be evaluated but ultimately agreed. Max argued for an O.R. release. The State opposed the release based on “25 pages of criminal history” including that the client had an out-of-State fugitive warrant. The court denied the request for an O.R. release. * One of Max’s clients was in court for a Sentencing hearing on a charge of DUI-3rd Offense and Eluding a Police Officer. Max presented numerous documents in support of his mitigation argument including 3 new exhibits today. The court took a recess to review the new exhibits (and to allow the prosecutor time to do so). The State had several corrections to the Presentence Investigation Report. Matt had no additional corrections. (Matt informed the Court that attorney Mary Brown reviewed the Presentence Report with the client). Matt argued for his client to be placed in the DUI Diversion Court on the DUI count and to be given a suspended sentence of 24-60 months prison on the Eluding count. The State joined in that recommendation pursuant to the Guilty Plea Agreement. The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation. | | | |