|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 25, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court – Dept II | Judge | Thomas Gregory |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Stermitz | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy and Chelsea Mazza  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 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and Motion 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?**  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 / 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 / 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 clients pled guilty, pursuant to a guilty plea agreement, to one count of Possession of a Controlled Substance. Sentencing will be a mandatory deferred judgment. The client intends to enter the Drug Court program as part of the deferred sentencing. The sentencing was set for 12/9/2024 for the client to be admitted into the drug court program prior to the sentencing hearing. * Matt’s other client today has a jury trial scheduled for December 3-5, 2024. The parties argued the State’s Motion to introduce prior bad act evidence. The State called one witness (DCSO Sergeant Justin Williams). | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

At the conclusion of the arguments the court took the matter under advisement. The parties had also submitted their proposed jury instructions. The State used instructions from the Nevada State Instructions. Matt submitted instructions regarding the elements of crimes and lesser offenses that the State objects to their use. The arguments regarding the instructions will occur at a later time.