|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 13, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Paul Gilbert |
| Defense Attorney | Brian Filter | Prosecutor(s) | Ric Casper  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 7 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Pretrial Conferences, Sentencings, Order to Show Cause, Alternative Sentencing Violation | | |
| **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?**  Brian appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Brian appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Brian 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):**   * Three of Brian’s clients failed to appear today:  1. The client was in an inpatient treatment program. The hearing was continued to 12/18/2024. 2. The client’s ride fell through. She called Brian to let him know. The court issued an OSC hearing for 12/04/2024. 3. The client also failed to appear yesterday in District Court and the District Court issued a bench warrant for the client. The East Fork Justice Court judge also issued a bench warrant based on the clients FTA today. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Brian’s clients appeared by video and entered a guilty plea, pursuant to negotiations to Principal to Theft, a misdemeanor. Both sides were free to argue. The State argued for an active 20 day jail sentence. Brian argued for a suspended sentence of 30 days jail. The court sentenced the client to 180 days jail suspended with conditions.
* One of Brian’s clients pled guilty, pursuant to negotiations, to a DUI first offense with a joint sentencing recommendation. The sentencing hearing was continued to 11/20/2024 for the client to obtain a substance use evaluation prior to the sentencing hearing.
* One of Brian’s clients pled guilty, pursuant to negotiations, to a DUI first offense and Possession of a Firearm While Under the Influence. The parties made a joint sentencing recommendation. The court followed the joint recommendation.
* One of Brian’s clients provided proof of insurance. Based upon that proof the State dismissed the charge.