|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 18, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Brian Filter | Prosecutor(s) | Kallie Nelson  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 | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment, Status, 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?**  Brian appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Brian 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:**  Brian had 3 clients on calendar today:   1. Sentencing hearing. The client was out-of-custody and appeared in person. The client previously pled guilty to Driving without Insurance. Client brought in proof of after acquired insurance. Pursuant to negotiations, the client was sentenced to the statutory minimum fine, fees, and assessments totaling $198. [Note: the client also had a felony drug charge that had been previously bound over to District Court.] 2. Arraignment hearing. The client was out-of-custody and appeared by Zoom. The parties are still waiting on receiving the casino video surveillance. Brian requested that the Arraignment be continued for 2 weeks. The State had no objection. The Arraignment was continued to March 11, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. The court authorized the client to appear at the next hearing by Zoom. 3. Status hearing. The client was out-of-custody and appeared in person. Spanish interpreter Patty Bisbee was present to assist the client. The client had a bench warrant outstanding for previously failing to appear in this case. Based on his appearance today, the Court withdrew the Bench Warrant. Brian informed the court that the case was likely to resolve through negotiations. However, his client wanted time to discuss the settlement offer with his immigration attorney prior to accepting the offer. Brian requested a two-week continuance. The State did not oppose the continuance. The Status hearing was continued to March 11, 2025, at 1:30 p.m. | | | |