|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez by Zoom video |
| Date | April 18, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Eastline Justice Court | Judge | Kenneth Quirk |
| Defense Attorney | Andrew Fritz | Prosecutor(s) | Daniel Roche  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 1 |
| Defendants 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 | Pretrial 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?**  Andrew appeared to be prepared for his case today. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Andrew appeared to be knowledgeable about his case today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Andrew’s 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:**  Andrew represented 1 client during today’s court session:   1. Client 1: Pretrial conference. The client is out-of-custody and appeared by Zoom video.   Andrew informed the court that the parties had reached a settlement. In exchange for his client’s No Contest plea to Count 1 (Battery, a misdemeanor), the State will dismiss counts 2 and 3. The parties will jointly recommend a sentence of 6 months jail suspended for 6 months on the condition of “good conduct.”  The client pled No Contest to Count 1 Battery, a misdemeanor. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the No Contest plea.  The State dismissed Counts 2 and 3.  The parties made the joint sentencing recommendation described above.  Andrew made an argument in mitigation and in support of the joint recommendation.  The client made a statement of allocation.  The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation as described above.  [Note: there was no mention in court as to whether the victim had been notified of his/her right to give a victim impact statement]. | | | |