|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 8, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Sixth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Michael Montero |
| Defense Attorney | Steve Cochran | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Russell  Deputy District Attorney |
| 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 | Review 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 / Unknown |
| Did the Attorney appear prepared to handle their clients' cases? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **How prepared did the Attorney appear?**  Steve appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Steve appeared to be knowledgeable about his case. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Good. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  I was unable to form an opinion regarding the attorney-client communication from today’s hearing. | | | |
| **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:**  Steve had 1 client on calendar today:   1. First Client: Review hearing. The client is currently in custody at the Nevada State Department of Corrections serving out his prison sentence. The client is not present in court. Steve reminded the court that the client was not expected to appear in court today. The purpose of the hearing is to address an error in the Judgment of Conviction. Specifically, the Judgment of Conviction erroneously indicates that the presentence credit for time served is 253 days. However, the correct number of days is 224 days. The Nevada Department of Parole and Probation confirms that it erred when it listed 253 days credit time served in the Presentence Investigation Report. Parole and Probation states that the correct number of days for presentence credit for time served is 224 days. The State concurs with 224 days presentence credit and that the Judgment should be amended to reflect the correct number of days credit for presentence time served. Steve does not object to the correction. The court ordered that the Judgment of Conviction be corrected to reflect the correct number of days credit for presentence time served, 224 days rather than 253. | | | |