|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | November 13, 2024 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Paul Gilbert |
| Defense Attorney | Max Stovall | Prosecutor(s) | Ric Casper  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 7 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Hearing Types | Status Hearings, 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?**  Max appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Max appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Max 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. | | | |
| **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 Max’s clients appeared by video. An interpreter also appeared by video. The client pled guilty, pursuant to settlement negotiations, to DUI second offense. The remaining counts were dismissed. The sentencing was set for 12/18/24 to enable the client to obtain a substance use evaluation prior to the sentencing. | | | |

Remarks/Recommendations/Notes, continued:

* One of Max’s clients pled guilty, pursuant to negotiations, to Driving Without a Valid Driver’s License. The joint sentencing recommendation was for the client to pay fines, fees and assessments that total $138.00. The remaining counts were dismissed. The court followed the joint recommendation.
* One of Max’s clients had a review hearing regarding payment of $2,000 in restitution and proof that the client’s dog had been surrendered for destruction. The client was not present but the parties had agreed to waive the client’s appearance. The hearing was continued to March 19, 2025.
* One of Max’s clients had a status hearing today. No resolution had been reached. The case was set for a preliminary hearing on 1/9/2025.
* One of Max’s clients failed to appear for today’s hearing. The State requested a bench warrant. Max argued for an Order to Show Cause hearing. The court ordered that the case be scheduled for an Order to Show Cause hearing on 12/11/2024.
* Another one of Max’s clients failed to appear today. The State requested a bench warrant. Max argued for an Order to Show Cause hearing. The client had also failed to report to the Department of Alternative Sentencing as required by the conditions of release. The court issued a bench warrant for the client’s arrest.
* One of Max’s clients had their case continued so that the parties could have additional time to try and reach a settlement. The client has not waived 60 days. (The State was represented by Deputy DA Jim Sibley for this case). The next hearing is set for 12/11/2024. Judge Gilbert put on the record that he knew the client’s family, but that he did not believe that knowledge would cause him to be impartial. Neither party requested that Judge Gilbert recuse himself from hearing the case.