|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 29, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | Ric Casper  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 | 1 |
| Hearing Types | 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?**  Mary appeared prepared for court except that she had just recently received the client’s school records wanted for the court’s consideration for the sentencing hearing and only received the Presentence Investigation Report yesterday. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Mary appeared to be knowledgeable about her case. | | | |
| **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 / N/A |
| 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 1 client scheduled for court this morning:  Client 1: Sentencing hearing. The client was out of custody and present in court.  Mary asked the court to continue the hearing 1 week based on the delay in receiving the client’s school records and the Presentence Investigation Report. Mary stated that she did not receive the school records until last week and did not receive the Presentence Investigation Report until yesterday morning.  The State opposed the continuance. The prosecutor, Ric Casper, said that the only reason he opposed the continuance is because the State wants to sentence both the client and the co-defendant on the same day and the co-defendant is not willing to continue the hearing. The State also mentioned that the victims are present today for the sentencing hearing.  The court informed the parties that it is inclined to continue the hearing one week. The court offered to take the victim impact statements today so that the victims would not need to come back next week. The prosecutor spoke with the victims and informed the court that they are available to return next week.  The co-defendant and her attorney, Matt Stermitz, were also present in the courtroom. The judge asked Matt Stermitz during the hearing if he and his client would be willing to continue the sentencing for 1 week. Matt spoke with his client and then informed the court that his client is nervous and would like to have the hearing today but is willing to continue the hearing to next week.  The court continued both sentencing hearings to next week (5/6/2025 at 9:00 a.m.) | | | |