|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 7, 2025 | County | Pershing |
| Court | Eleventh Judicial District Court | Judge | Jim Shirley |
| Defense Attorney | Steve Cochran  Pershing County Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Bryce Shields, District Attorney  Paul Yohey, Deputy DA |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 4 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 2 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and Probation Violation 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?**  Steve appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Steve 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, except that 2 of Steve’s clients did not appear for their hearings today probably believing that the court would grant the stipulation to continue filed by Steve and the prosecutor. | | | |
| **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:**  Steve had 4 clients on today’s court calendar:   1. First Client: Disposition hearing on a Probation Violation. The client is in custody and present in person.   Steve advised the Court that he is trying to get his client accepted into an inpatient substance use treatment program. Steve requested that today’s hearing be continued for 2 weeks. The State did not object to the continuance. The court continued the Disposition hearing to 4/21/2025 at 9:00 a.m. There was no argument regarding the client’s custody status. The client will remain in custody pending the next hearing.   1. Second Client: Arraignment. The client is in custody and present in person.   The client pled guilty to one count of Failure to Register as a Sex Offender, a category D felony. Probation is possible. Pursuant to the negotiations, both sides will recommend probation at time of sentencing. The State agrees to dismiss count II. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. Sentencing is set for 6/2/2025 at 9:00 a.m. The court ordered the preparation of a Presentence Investigation. The parties stipulated to the client being released on his Own Recognizance. The State requested conditions of release to include Pretrial Services supervision. Steve opposed the supervision by Pretrial Services. The court ordered that the client be released on his own recognizance with supervision by Pretrial Services pending the sentencing hearing.   1. Third Client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and not present in court.   Steve reminded the court that today’s hearing was originally set when the client failed to appear at the last hearing. The reason the client failed to appear was due to medical issues. The parties stipulated at the last hearing to continue that hearing to today. Last week, both the prosecutor and defense attorney were ill and out of the office for most of the week. Consequently, the parties filed a stipulation at the end of last week to continue today’s hearing for 2 weeks. Last Friday the Court denied the stipulation to continue and left the matter on calendar for today. Steve does not know why his client failed to appear today, but believes it is because of the anticipated continuance by stipulation. Both parties today asked the court to continue this hearing for 2 weeks. The court continued today’s hearing continued to 4/21/2025 at 9:00 a.m.   1. Fourth Client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and not present in court.   Steve explained to the court that because both he and the prosecutor were out of their offices for most of last week due to illness, they had agreed to continued today’s hearing for 2 weeks. They filed a stipulation to continue last week. On Friday of last week the court denied the stipulation to continue. Steve does not know why his client is not present today but believes that it is because the client anticipated that the stipulation to continue would be granted. Both parties asked the court to continue today’s hearing to 4/21/2025 at 9:00 a.m. The court continued today’s hearing continued to 4/21/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |