|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 13, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Paul Gilbert |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | Ric Casper  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 5 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Pretrial Conferences and Post-Sentencing Review Hearings | | |
| **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. | | | |
| **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):**   * One of Mary’s clients was scheduled for a post-sentencing review hearing. The client was not present because he is in an inpatient treatment program. The hearing was continued to 11/20/2024 for proof that the client has completed the inpatient treatment program. The client has paid the fines, fees, and assessments. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Mary’s clients had 2 cases on calendar today.

1. A post-sentencing review hearing for the client to show proof of enrollment and participation in alcohol counseling and domestic violence counseling.
2. A new case. The prosecutor just provided a settlement offer today. Time is needed for the client to consider the offer.

Both cases were continued to 12/11/2024.

* One of Mary’s clients has a co-defendant represented by Kris Brown. The parties want to try and keep the co-defendants cases on calendar together. Because Kris’ client failed to appear and her hearing was continued to 12/4/2024 this case was continued to that date as well. This client appeared by Zoom.
* One of Mary’s clients had been at Behavioral Health Services and was transferred to the Gospel Mission residential treatment program. That client ran from the treatment program. That client did not appear in court today. The court issued a bench warrant for this client’s arrest.
* One of Mary’s clients pled guilty, pursuant to negotiations, to DUI first offense, Driving on a Suspended Driver’s License and No Insurance. The parties made a joint sentencing recommendation. The court followed the joint recommendation.