|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 27, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Elko Justice Court – Department B | Judge | Bryan Drake |
| Defense Attorney | Brea Revier  Deputy Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Phillip Carwane  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 2 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In Custody | 0 | Number of Clients  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Pre-Preliminary Hearing and Pretrial Conference | | |
| **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?**  Brea appeared to be prepared for her case today. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Brea appeared to be knowledgeable about her case today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Brea’s 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:**  Brea had 2 clients on today’s calendar:   1. First client: Client was scheduled for a pre-preliminary hearing. The client was out-of-custody and appeared by Zoom. The parties were unable to reach a resolution. The matter was set for preliminary hearing on 3/26/2025 at 9:00 a.m. 2. Second client: Client was scheduled for a pretrial conference. The client was out-of-custody and appeared in person. There was a Spanish speaking interpreter to assist the client. The parties were able to reach a resolution. The client pled No Contest to Trespassing. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the No Contest plea. Pursuant to negotiations, the State recommended a sentence of 3 days active jail with credit for 20 hours time served. Brea argued in mitigation and in support of her recommendation for a sentence of 3 days jail suspended for 3 months (with credit for 20 hours served) on the condition of “good conduct.” The client made a statement in allocation. Sentence: 2 days and 20 hours jail with 20 hours active jail and credit for 20 hours time served, the balance of 2 days suspended for 6 months on the condition of “good conduct.” | | | |