|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 26, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court – Dept I | Judge | Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | Jim Sibley and William Murphy  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 3 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Arraignments and Motion to Modify Probation | | |
| **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 with 2 of her 3 clients today. One of her clients told the court that he wanted a different attorney because he “does not communicate well” with Mary. He also said that she is difficult to get in touch with and she has hung up on him. | | | |
| **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 Mary’s clients was scheduled for an Arraignment. However, he asked the court to assign a different appointed attorney. He claimed that he does not communicate well with Mary, that he has trouble reaching her, and that one time she hung up on him.” The court continued the hearing to December 17, 2024. During that time the client will determine whether he wants to retain private counsel, represent himself, continue with Mary, or ask the Douglas County Department of Indigent Defense Services to assign a different attorney. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Mary’s clients was on calendar for her Motion to Amend Conditions of Probation. The client wanted to modify the terms of his probation to allow him to attend the Salvation Army inpatient treatment and rehabilitation program. The court ordered that the client’s probation be modified to allow him to enter the Salvation Army treatment program or other treatment program of his choosing. The condition prohibiting the client to enter any local businesses was lifted.
* Mary’s final client was scheduled for an Arraignment but did not appear. The client sent an email to Mary this morning stating that he had miscalendared the hearing date and it was too late to appear. The court set the matter for an Order to Show Cause hearing and continued Arraignment for 12/10/2028.