|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 29, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Stermitz | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Thomas  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 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?**  Matt appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Matt 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 / 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:**  Matt had 3 client on calendar today:   1. First client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. Matt informed the court that the parties discussed possible settlement today. However, prior to finalizing an agreement, the State needs to contact the victim for a restitution amount and for victim input. Matt requested that the Arraignment be continued to a date in May. The court set a Continued Arraignment hearing for 5/20/ 2025 at 1:30 p.m. 2. Second Client: Status Hearing. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. Matt informed the court that the parties reached a resolution in this case. Pursuant to those negotiations, the client will plead guilty to Disorderly Conduct and the remaining counts will be dismissed. The parties will jointly recommend a sentence of 90 days jail with 80 of those days suspended for 1 year on conditions of Department of Alternative Sentencing supervision, sobriety, search, seizure, and testing for the presence of drugs, alcohol, and/or marijuana, and that the client violate no laws. The State confirmed the agreement and informed the court that the Sentencing hearing needs to be continued for victim notification and possible victim impact statement. The client entered a guilty plea to Disorderly Conduct. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. The State dismissed the remaining counts. Sentencing was set for 5/27/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 3. Third client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. Matt informed the court that he was just assigned to the case yesterday and he needs more time to discuss the case with the client. Matt requested that the Arraignment be continued. The court continued the Arraignment hearing to 6/3/2025 at 1:30 p.m. | | | |