|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | March 4, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Nathan Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Stermitz | Prosecutor(s) | Zach Wadle  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 1 |
| Juveniles Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Disposition 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?**  Matt appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Matt appeared to be knowledgeable about his case. | | | |
| **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 release from detention? | | | 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 the Petition Hearing? | | | 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  the Disposition Hearing? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney address the Juvenile Probation Office Disposition Report and/or  Psychosexual Evaluation/Risk Assessment appropriately? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the court require juvenile(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:**  Matt had one juvenile on the law and motion calendar today. It was a Disposition hearing. In court Matt explained, in response to a question from the court, that he had reviewed the Juvenile Probation Office Report, that his juvenile client had reviewed the report, but that they had not reviewed it together.  Matt had no corrections to make to the report. The juvenile client had no corrections. The State had no corrections. The juvenile’s mother (who was present in court) had no corrections. The Juvenile Probation Officer had no corrections to make to the report.  All parties agreed with the JPO report recommendations and asked the court to follow those disposition recommendations.  Order: The child was found by the Court to be a delinquent child. The court adopted the JPO recommendations, including the special conditions of substance use evaluation and counseling and that the juvenile not be present at any location in the Stateline NV casino core (except as necessary to travel with his parents). | | | |