|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 24, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Fourth Judicial District Court Dept 1 | Judge | Kriston Hill |
| Defense Attorney | Thomas Gunter  Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Daniel Roche  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 0 |
| 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 | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment | | |
| **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?**  Thomas appeared to be prepared for his case today. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Thomas appeared to be knowledgeable about his case today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Matt did a good job advocating for his client during the court hearing. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good. However, when the client was asked during the court canvass “if he had discussed any possible defenses with his attorney,” the client said “no.” | | | |
| **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 (continued from reverse side):**  Thomas had one client on calendar today for an arraignment hearing. The client was out of custody and appeared in person.Pursuant to negotiations, the client agreed to plead No Contest to one count of False Information to Obtain a Big Game Tag (Mountain Lion and Antelope), a gross misdemeanor. The agreement involved the parties  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes Continued from Previous Page:**  waiving a Presentence Investigation Report and the State agreeing to recommend a fine of up to $2,000 and no jail time. However, during the court canvass of the client, when the Court asked the client whether he had discussed any possible defenses with his attorney, the client said no. The court continued the hearing one week to enable the client to speak further with his attorney regarding any possible defenses and to confirm that he fully understood his options, his rights, and still wanted to go forward with the No Contest plea. | | | |