|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 26, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court – Dept I  Juvenile Court | Juvenile Judge | Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Ence | Prosecutor(s) | Zac Wadle  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual - w/Client | Number of Clients | 1 |
| Juvenile Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Detention Hearing and Petition 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 to be prepared for the hearing. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Matt appeared to be knowledgeable about his case. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Good. | | | |
| **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 the Petition hearing? | | | 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  disposition? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney address the Juvenile Probation Report 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):**  Matt’s client was in detention on an allegation of consuming alcohol in violation of the terms of his probation. The client appeared by video from the Stateline Juvenile Detention Center (note: the weather conditions were bad. Ordinarily, the juveniles are brought to court from the detention center). Matt was present in court.  The State filed a Petition Alleging Delinquency yesterday afternoon, but it did not reach Matt until the court hearing. The court took a recess to allow Matt to discuss the Petition with his client by telephone.  When the court hearing resumed, the client admitted the allegation in the Petition (violating his probation by  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from previous page)**  consuming alcohol. admitted the allegation of Minor in Possession of Alcohol.  Matt argued for his client’s release from detention pending the Disposition hearing. The Court inquired of the parties if there was any reason why Disposition could not be done at this time. (Note: this was not the client’s first petition – he was already on probation; the client has already had a substance use evaluation which found him to have a severe addiction to alcohol.) The State and Juvenile Probation Office indicated that they were prepared to go forward with disposition today. The State informed the court that their recommendation would be placement at the Western Nevada Regional Youth Center for inpatient treatment. After conferring with his client, Matt informed the Court that they were ready to proceed to disposition as well. Matt explained to the Court that his client does not want to go to WNRYC but prefers to be sent to the China Spring Youth Camp.  The Court ordered that the client be sent to WNRYC to complete its inpatient treatment program. The Court further ordered that the client remain in detention pending his placement at WNRYC. | | | |