

Walker River Justice Court
March 6, 2025

Judge: Pete Spinuzzi

Prosecutors: Sean Neahusan

Summary of Observation Visit

No. of scheduled cases for indigent defendants: 18

No. of cases where defendant is in custody: 2

No. of cases where defendant is out of custody: 16

No. of cases being handled by attorney Kale Brock: 18

In custody: 2

Out of custody: 16

Cases continued for in custody: 0

Cases continued for out of custody: 10

Observation Checklist from Davis Monitor

(1) Did the attorney have a substantive, confidential meeting with each client before court (If you know or can tell from observation): Yes.

(2) Did the attorney argue for pretrial release/OR, or for reasonable bail: Not applicable.

(3) Did the court require the defendant(s) to reimburse the entity for representation: No.

(4) Did the attorney counsel each client to refrain from waiving trial rights until the attorney completed investigation of the case (If you know): Not applicable.

(5) Did the attorney appear to have counseled clients to refrain from waiving any rights at arraignment: Yes.

(6) Did the attorney appear to know his client's cases and to be prepared: Yes.

(7) Did the attorney appear to adequately advise clients of the consequences of accepting a guilty plea or going to trial, including any collateral consequences: Yes.

(8) Did the attorney appear to have a sustainable workload: Yes.

(9) Overall, did the attorney appear to be providing effective representation of his clients: Yes.

Monitor's Request in 12th Report of the Monitor (Page 12)

In the 12th Report of the Monitor, the Monitor indicated on page 12 that it would be helpful to have clear metrics to apply to court observation and issues of remote appearances. The Monitor posed four (4) questions that if answered would be helpful to the Monitor. The following are the questions together with answers to assist the Monitor.

(1) Did the attorney show up: Yes.

(2) Did the attorney have his files: Yes.

(3) Did the attorney appear to know information about the clients and there cases in addition to what was presented by the prosecutors: Yes.

(4) In any sentencing hearing, did the attorney for the defendant present mitigating information or elaboration on the pre-sentencing report: There were no pre-sentencing reports.

Additional Information and/or Comments

One of the continuances was because defendant was in the hospital. One of the continuances was because counsel for the defendant had to withdraw due to a conflict. New counsel has been appointed for that defendant. One of the continuances was because defendant also has a case in Fernley Municipal Court and his counsel in that case is working on a global resolution. One of the cases was continued because defendant also has a case in Churchill County and counsel wanted to wait until that case was resolved before proceeding with the case in Walker River Justice Court.