|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | October 21, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court – Dept 2 | Judge | Thomas Gregory |
| Defense Attorney | Krishna Prasad | Prosecutor(s) | Chelsea Mazza  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 1 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment | | |
| **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 / Unknown |
| Did the Attorney appear prepared to handle their clients' cases? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **How prepared did the Attorney appear?**  Krishna appeared prepared for the hearing. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Krishna appeared to be knowledgeable about his case. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Krishna did a good job advocating for his client during the court hearing. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  I was unable to form an opinion based upon today’s hearing regarding the attorney/client communication. | | | |
| **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):**   * Krishna’s client was on calendar for an Arraignment on a felony charge of Driving Under the Influence with Two Prior Convictions. However, the District Attorney’s Office learned/confirmed that one of the two alleged prior convictions had been dismissed. Consequently, the DDA moved the court to remand the case back to the East Fork Justice Court for further proceedings as a DUI Second Offense, misdemeanor. Krishna joined in the motion for remand of the case to justice court. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* Krishna’s client did not appear for the hearing. Krishna explained that it may have been confusion on the part of his client, as they knew that the case was going to be remanded back to the justice court. Krishna waived his client’s appearing at today’s hearing.
* The court remanded the case back to the East Fork Justice Court with the next court date set for 10/23/2024 at 9:00 a.m.