|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | October 07, 2024 | County | Pershing |
| Court | Eleventh Judicial District Court | Judge | Jim Shirley |
| Defense Attorney | Steven Cochran  Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Bryce Shields, District Attorney  Paul Yohey, 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 | Arraignment, Pretrial Conferences, and Review 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?**  Steven appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Steven appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Steven did a good job advocating for his clients during the court hearing. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good, with the exception of one client had failed to notify Steven of his change of address and phone number post-sentencing and did not appear for the review heairng. | | | |
| **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 Steven’s clients pled guilty, pursuant to a guilty plea agreement, to a category C felony charge of Possession of a Stolen Motor Vehicle. The joint sentencing recommendation is for probation with a requirement that the client remain in custody until he can enter an inpatient treatment program at Step One in Reno. The sentencing hearing was scheduled for 12/16/2024. * One of Steven’s clients entered a not guilty plea at his arraignment. The client did not waive any rights. The Jury trial would be scheduled in December, 2024. Steven argued for bail to be lowered from $400,000 to | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

$7,000. The court ordered that the bail be lowered to $100,000.

* Steven’s final client for this morning’s court was scheduled for a post-sentencing review hearing. The client had been out of custody and out of court for over 1 year. The client had failed to appear at the previous review hearing and failed to appear today. Steven explained to the court that he has been unable to contact the client as the contact information that he has for the client is no longer current. Steven asked for one additional continuance so that he can continue to try and locate the client. The court granted the continuance and scheduled the review hearing for 10/21/2024.