|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez by Zoom video |
| Date | March 13, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Union Justice Court | Senior Judge | Michael Mavity |
| Defense Attorney | Krishna Prasad | Prosecutor(s) | Wendy Maddox  Deputy DA |
| 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 | Pretrial 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?**  Krishna appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Krishna appeared to be knowledgeable about his 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 / 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 / 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:**  Krishna had 1 client on calendar today:   1. Pretrial hearing: The client was in custody and appeared by Zoom video from the jail. Krishna informed the court that the client’s 2 cases on calendar today have been resolved through negotiations.  * In one case, the client: (1) waived his right to a preliminary hearing to plead guilty to Possession of a Controlled Substance, a category E felony, which is a mandatory diversion case; and, (2) pled guilty to a misdemeanor Assault charge (reduced from a felony Assault with a Deadly Weapon charge).   The client and Krishna were directed to sign and file the written Unconditional Waiver of Preliminary Hearing form with the court as soon as possible.  Procedurally, because both counts were part of the same court case number, and one count is being bound over to district court and one count is remaining in the justice court, a new/separate complaint needed to be filed generating a new justice court case number. The parties agreed to have a copy of the original complaint made by the court and filed under a separate case number.  On the original case, the State struck the Assault with a Deadly Weapon charge by interlineation so that the sole count remaining in the original case number is the Possession of Controlled Substance charge. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the waiver of preliminary hearing and bound this case over to the District Court with an Arraignment date of 4/8/2025 at 9:00 a.m.  In the new case number, the Possession of a Controlled Substance charge was stricken by interlineation, and the Assault with a Deadly Weapon charge was amended by interlineation to misdemeanor Assault. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea, and set the Sentencing hearing for 4/10/2025 at 9:00 a.m.   * In the second case, the client was charged with 3 misdemeanor offenses. All 3 misdemeanors are dismissed pursuant to the negotiations.   The parties further agreed to jointly recommend that the client be released on his own recognizance today on a GPS monitor. The court ordered that the client is released on his own recognizance with conditions including supervision by Pretrial Services with a Global Positioning System Monitor. | | | |