|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 29, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Brian Filter | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Thomas  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 4 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 1 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment, Status, and Post-Sentencing Review 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?**  Brian appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Brian 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 / 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:**  Brian had 4 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. The client entered a Not Guilty plea and waived his right to a trial within 60 days. A status hearing was set for 6/3/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 2. Second Client: Post-Sentencing Review Hearing. The client is out-of-custody and not present. Brian informed the court that he did not know why the client was not present. The client owes $198 in fines, fees, and assessments. Brian requested that an Order to Show Cause hearing be set rather than a bench warrant being issued. The court set an Order to Show Cause hearing for 5/20/2025 at 1:30 p.m. The client shall either pay the $198 prior to that hearing or appear in person on 5/20/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 3. Third client: Status. The client is out-of-custody and present by Zoom video. Brian informed the court that he had just received a settlement offer from the State. The offer is contingent on some things being accomplished first. Brian requested a continuance to June. The State did not object to the continuance. The Status hearing was continued to 6/3/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 4. Fourth client: Post-Sentencing Review and Motion to Revoke Suspended Sentence hearing. The client is in custody and present by Zoom video from the jail. The State filed a Motion to Revoke the Suspended Sentence based upon the client’s failure to comply with numerous conditions of her suspended sentence. The defense admits (the client admits) the failure to comply but opposes the revocation of the suspended sentence. Brian argued in mitigation that the client was in a serious car accident shortly after the sentencing hearing and has gone through a long recovery period. Brian recommended that the court impose a consequence of time served and reinstate the client on probation with the balance of the underlying jail sentence resuspended. The court ordered the client to serve 5 days jail with credit for time served, resuspended the balance of the jail time with new deadlines to complete the active terms of the sentence. The client still needs to pay the fines, fees, and assessments, complete the domestic violence counseling sessions, the community service hours, and pay restitution. The court ordered that the client sign the Domestic Violence Firearm Form prior to release from custody. The court set a Review hearing for 6/17/2025 at 1:30 p.m. | | | |