|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 5, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy and Heidi Remick  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 9 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 4 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 5 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 4 |
| Hearing Types | Status hearings, Sentencing hearings, Alternative Sentencing Violation 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?**  Mary appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Mary appeared to be knowledgeable about her 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:**  Mary had 11 clients on today’s calendar:   1. Mary’s first client was found Not Competent by the examiners with no prospect of being restored to competency. The criminal complaint and charges were dismissed. The State requested the court ot order the client to remain in custody of to 10 days for the State to file civil commitment proceedings. Mary opposed that request. The court ordered the client to remain in custody up to 10 additional days. 2. Mary’s second client was in custody and set for sentencing today on a DUI-2nd offense and misdemeanor Eluding a Police Officer. The client had been arrested on an allegation hat he violated the terms of his release. The client admitted violating the conditions of release.   The client needs to obtain a Substance Use Evaluation prior to sentencing.  The client also has a district court case pending. The client is out on bond in the district court case.  Mary argued for her client’s release on his own recognizance and for a continuance to obtain the evaluation. The client plans to enter an inpatient treatment program.  The State argued that the client should remain in custody until placement at the inpatient treatment program.  The court continued the sentencing hearing to 2/26/2025 and ordered the client to be released on his own recognizance with conditions.   1. Mary’s third client had a status hearing today. The parties reached a settlement agreement. The client pled No Contest to Disorderly Conduct. There was a joint recommendation that the client be sentenced to time served (1 day jail) concurrent to her sentencing in 24-CR-00484.   The client waived her right of allocation.  The victim waived his right to provide a victim impact statement.  The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation.  In case 24-CR-00484 the client had a Review hearing scheduled for 2/12/2025. At the client’s request and with no opposition from the State, the court vacated the 2/12/2025 hearing and set a Review hearing for 3/19/2025 at 2:00 p.m.   1. Mary’s fourth client had a status hearing today. The parties reached a settlement agreement. The client pled Guilty to Principal to Petit Larceny. There was a joint recommendation that the client be sentenced to: time served plus 160 days jail suspended for 1 year on conditions, plus a $500 fine and restitution.   The client exercised her right of allocation explaining that she was on drugs at the time of this offense and since this offense she has been sober and that she is working hard on her sobriety.  The victim (Famous Footwear) waived its right to provide a victim impact statement.  The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation. The $500 fine and $140 in fees and assessments were taken from the cash bail previously posted. The restitution had already been paid in full by the co-defendant.   1. Mary’s fifth client had a status hearing today. Mary informed the court that the parties were very close to reaching a resolution in this case. Mary requested that the case be continued to 2/12/2025. Mary informed the court that the client has obtained a Substance Use Evaluation so that if the case resolves at the next hearing the case can proceed directly to sentencing. The court granted the requested continuance. 2. Mary’s sixth client did not appear in court today. Mary requested that the matter be continued. Mary explained that this client is developmentally delayed and has a case manager who assists him. Mary had tried to reach the client by telephone when he did not appear for court, but the call went directly to voice mail. The court set an Order to Show Cause for 2/12/2025 at 2:00 p.m. 3. Mary’s seventh client was scheduled for a Sentencing hearing today on a DUI-1st offense charge. However, the client failed to appear. Mary was unable to reach the client today by telephone. Mary requested a 2 week continuance. The State requested a bench warrant be issued. The court issued an Order to Show Cause for 2/12/2025 at 2:00 p.m. 4. Mary’s eighth client had a status hearing today. Mary informed the court that the parties were still working to resolve the case. Mary requested that the case be continued to 2/19/2025. The court granted the requested continuance.   **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (Continued from the previous page):**   1. Mary’s ninth client had a status hearing today. The parties reached a settlement agreement. The client pled Guilty to Theft, a misdemeanor. There was a joint recommendation that the client be sentenced to: 180 days jail with 120 of those days suspended for 1 year on conditions. The client was currently in custody and would be given credit for his time served toward the 60 days active jail.   The client waived his right of allocation.  The victim (Target) waived its right to provide a victim impact statement.  The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation.  The remaining counts were dismissed. | | | |