|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | March 5, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Justin Clouser | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Thomas and William Murphy  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 | 1 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Status and Order to Show Cause 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?**  Justin appeared prepared for court for one of the clients but did not appear to be aware of the second client being on calendar. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Justin appeared to be knowledgeable about one of his cases but was not present for the second hearing. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Good. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good with one of the clients. I was unable to form an opinion regarding the other client. | | | |
| **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:**  Justin had two cases on calendar today.   1. First client: Status hearing. The client was in custody and present in person. The client is represented by Marc Picker. Justin was covering the hearing in Marc’s absence. The parties had previously negotiated this case. If the client had complied with the terms of the agreement, this case would have been dismissed. Unfortunately, the client violated the agreement by committing a new crime. The parties set this case for a preliminary hearing on April 18, 2025, at 10:00 a.m. 2. Second client: Order to Show Cause. This client is out-of-custody on this East Fork Justice Court case. However, the client is currently serving a prison sentence with the Nevada Department of Corrections unrelated to this East Fork Justice Court case. The client was not transported from the prison and was not present in court. Justin had been in court for the first client but had left court prior to this case being called. The court ordered that this hearing be continued to a new date. | | | |