|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 24, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Fourth Judicial District Court Dept 1 | Judge | Kriston Hill |
| Defense Attorney | Diana Hillewaert | 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 | 1 | Number of Clients  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment | | |
| **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?**  Diana appeared to be prepared for her case today. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Diana appeared to be knowledgeable about her case today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Diana did a good job advocating for her client during the court hearing. | | | |
| **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 / Unknown |
| 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 (continued from reverse side):**  Diana had one client on calendar today for an Arraignment hearing. The client was in custody and present in person. The court mentioned on the record that the Guilty Plea Agreement was filed today instead of the preceding Friday. Diana apologized for the late filing of the GPA.  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes Continued from Previous Page:**  The GPA was amended by interlineation in open court to reflect the correct location of the offense.  Pursuant to the negotiations, the client pled No Contest to one count of Sale of a Controlled Substance, a category C felony, and one count to Conspiracy to Violate the Uniform Controlled Substances Act, a category C felony. Both sides are free to argue at sentencing. The client is eligible for probation for these offenses, but probation is not mandatory. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the No Contest pleas.  Sentencing is scheduled for 4/21/2025 at 3:00 p.m. | | | |