|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | October 29, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy  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 |
| Hearing Types | Pretrial Conferences, Review Hearings, and an Order to Show Cause 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?**  Mary appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Mary appeared to be knowledgeable about her cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Mary did a good job advocating for her clients during the court hearing. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good, except that Mary had one client she was unable to contact. That client failed to appear at his last hearing and failed to appear at the Order to Show Cause hearing today. Mary did not have current contact information for that client. | | | |
| **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):**   * Mary’s only in custody client is being held in jail on another case currently in District Court. The misdemeanor case on calendar today is trailing the felony matter in district court. The misdemeanor case was continued to 11/12/2024. * Both of Mary’s clients that were scheduled for post-sentencing review hearings had complied with the terms of their suspended sentences. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Mary’s clients was scheduled for an OSC today following that client’s failure to appear at the last court hearing. Mary did not have current contact information for that client and had been unable to get in touch with that client. That client failed to appear today. A bench warrant was issued for the client’s arrest.
* One of Mary’s clients had been given a court date of January 13, 2025, by the jail staff when the client bailed out. That client did not appear in court today. Mary had only recently been appointed and had not yet met with the client. The case was continued to the January 13 date given by the jail.
* Mary covered one case for attorney Max Stovall. The client was on calendar today for a status conference. The case was set for a preliminary hearing on January 3, 2025.