|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | December 2, 2024 | County | Pershing |
| Court | Eleventh Judicial District Court | Judge | Jim Shirley |
| Defense Attorney | Steven Cochran  Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Bryce Shields, District Attorney  Paul Yohey, Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 6 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 4 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types |  | | |
| **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?**  Steven appeared to be prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Steven 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 good the communication has been between Steven and one client who asked for a new attorney. | | | |
| **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 Steven’s clients was on calendar following a settlement conference. The parties were unable to reach a resolution of the case and need to set if for trial. Steven informed the court that he will need to obtain expert witnesses and an investigator to assist with the preparation for trial. The client waived his right to a trial within 60 days. The court scheduled the case for a status conference on 1/16/2025 to see if the defense is ready to set the matter for trial. The court plans to pick a trial date at the 1/16/2025 hearing. * One of Steven’s clients showed up to court for an Arraignment. However, the client tested presumptive positive for THC. The court continued the Arraignment to 1/16/2025. The court did not find the client in contempt and allowed the client to remain out on her own recognizance. * One of Steven’s clients did not appear for her Review hearing today. Steven did not know why the client was not present but informed the court that the client was in frequent contact with him. The court did not issue a bench warrant or an order to show cause. Based on Steven’s representation that the client would like to participate in a settlement conference and the State’s agreement to participate, the court ordered that the matter would be scheduled for a Settlement Conference. * One of Steven’s clients was set for a competency review. The evaluating doctors concluded that the client is competent to stand trial. The State made a new settlement offer. The client plans to make a counter offer. The Court set the hearing for 12/16/2024 to find out if the case has been resolved or if it needs to be set for trial. * One of Steven’s clients had an Arraignment this morning on a charge of Theft of a Motor Vehicle. The client expressed his desire to discharge Steven from representing him. The court granted the client’s request and discharged Steven from representing the client. The court will notify NV DIDS of the need for a new attorney to assist the client. * One of Steven’s clients was set for sentencing today. The parties had no factual corrections to the Presentence Investigation Report. The parties made a joint sentencing recommendation for probation. The court followed the joint recommendation and sentenced the client to a suspended sentence of 24-60 months prison with conditions. | | | |