|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | October 01, 2024 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Sixth Judicial District Court | Judge | Michael Montero |
| Defense Attorney | Massey Mayo | Prosecutor(s) | Anthony Gordon  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 | Status Hearings and Sentencing 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?**  Massey appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Massey appeared to be knowledgeable about her cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Massey 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):**   * Two of Massey’s clients were in custody and appeared by Zoom from the Humboldt County jail. Massey was present in the courtroom.  1. One of the clients waived his right to a trial within 60 days. That client’s trial was set for March 25-28, 2025. A pretrial conference was scheduled for January 21, 2025. 2. The other client did not waive his right to a speedy trial. His trial was set for January 22-24, 2025. A pretrial conference was scheduled for December 17, 2024. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Massey’s clients was in custody but brought to court to appear in person. This client was scheduled for sentencing. Three factual corrections were made to the PreSentence Investigation report: (1) the attorney changed from Matt Stermitz to Massey Mayo; (2) the sentencing date was changed from the original date to today; (3) the credit for time served was changed to include the additional days in jail from the original sentencing date to today (currently 212 days jail credit). The client was being sentenced for a gross misdemeanor. The State argued for 364 days active jail with credit for time served of 212 days. Massey argued for 212 days jail with credit for 212 days served. The court sentenced the client to 212 days jail with credit for 212 days served. The client was also ordered to pay the $25 administrative assessment fee and $3 DNA assessment fee.
* One of Massey’s clients out of custody clients appeared in person for sentencing. The only Presentence Investigation report change was the attorney had changed from Matt Stermitz to Massey Mayo. Massey argued for probation (with no specific underlying sentence) and Drug Court as one of the conditions of probation. The State argued for 28-72 months active prison. The client spoke in allocation. The court sentenced the client to 24-60 months active prison with credit for time served of 68 days on the category B felony of Eluding a Police Officer. The court also ordered the mandatory assessment fees.
* Massey’s remaining client was out of custody and scheduled for a Sentencing hearing. The client did not appear for court. Massey requested a continuance and informed the court that the client had been keeping in regular communication with Massey and that they had prepared for today’s sentencing hearing. Massey did not know why the client was not present in court. The client had not contacted Massey’s office or the court to explain why he was not able to be present today. The State requested a bench warrant and reminded the court that the client had not appeared at the last hearing due to car trouble. That’s why the sentencing was continued to today. The court issued a bench warrant for the client with a no bail hold.