|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 18, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Max Stovall | Prosecutor(s) | 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 |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignments and 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?**  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:**  Good. | | | |
| **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 / 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:**  Max had three clients today:   1. Max’s first client was scheduled for an Arraignment. The clientpled guilty, pursuant to negotiations (GPA filed this morning), to one count of PCS, E felony. State will not oppose diversion. This is a mandatory diversion situation but not mandatory probation (client has 2 prior felony convictions). If the client does not seek diversion, the parties will jointly recommend 12-30 months NSP suspended, and the State will not request a treatment program as a condition of probation. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. PSI: Not ordered (yet). Sentencing: Not set (yet). Set for a Diversion hearing. Case recalled. Client does not intend to seek diversion. PSI ordered. Sentencing on 4/8/2025 at 9:00 a.m. (co-defendant also set for that date). Client was warned by the Judge not to come to the sentencing hearing positive for drugs. 2. Max’s second client was also scheduled for an Arraignment. The client pled Not Guilty to Burglary of a Business, a category C felony, and Unlawful Possession of False Sales Receipt; a category E felony. 60 days waived. Trial estimated for 2 days on 9/25/2025 & 9/26/2025. Pretrial 8/19/2025 (all motions must be ripe by that date). Jury instructions by 9/19/2025. 3. Max’s third client was a Review hearing regarding child support arrearages payments. The State of Nevada is already collecting and monitoring the payments, so the Court determined that it would not continue to monitor the payments but would leave that to the State. | | | |