|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez by Zoom video |
| Date | February 19, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Union Justice Court | Senior Judge | Michael Mavity |
| Defense Attorney | Robert Dolan | Prosecutor(s) | Stephen Girardot, 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 | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Sentencing | | |
| **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?**  Robert appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Robert 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 / 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:**  Robert had 1 client on calendar today. The client had 4 separate criminal cases.   1. In the first case**:** The matter was scheduled for a pretrial conference.Dolan informed the court that he plans to file a motion to disqualify the DA’s office from prosecuting Mr. Ruiz. The State requested that   **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from previous page):**  the matter be set for a preliminary hearing. The State put on the record that the settlement offer will be withdrawn 2 weeks from today. The court set the preliminary hearing for 4/22/2025 at 1:15 p.m.   1. In the second case: the matter was scheduled for a pretrial conference and a contempt hearing. Dolan informed the court that Dolan was confused regarding the contempt charge. Dolan said that a contempt hearing had already been held on this alleged violation of bail condition. The client had denied the alleged contempt. At the conclusion of that hearing, the court found that the client was not in violation. The court did not go forward today on the contempt charge. The court set the misdemeanor case for a bench trial on 4/24/2025 at 1:15 p.m. 2. In the third case: The matter was a misdemeanor charge scheduled for a pretrial conference. No attorney has been assigned because no jail time is possible. The case was set for a Review hearing on 4/29/2025 at 9:00 a.m. 3. In the fourth case: The matter was a misdemeanor charge scheduled for a pretrial conference. No attorney has been assigned because no jail time is possible. The case was set for a Review hearing on 4/29/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |