|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez by Zoom video |
| Date | March 20, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Carlin Justice Court | Judge | Brandy Holbrook |
| Defense Attorney | Thomas O’Gara  Deputy Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | No Prosecutor Present |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 3 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In Custody | 0 | Number of Clients  Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignments and Review 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?**  Thomas appeared to be prepared for his cases today. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Thomas appeared to be knowledgeable about all his cases today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Thomas’s 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 / Unknown |
| 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:**  [Note: Thomas explained that he was appearing by Zoom instead of in person because he is also scheduled to appear in the Elko Justice Court this morning. The Carlin Justice Court is approximately 30 minutes away from the Elko Justice Court.]  Thomas represented 3 clients during today’s court session:   1. Client 1: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. The client is charged with two misdemeanor offenses: (1) DUI-1st Offense and (2) Resisting a Public Officer. The client entered Not Guilty pleas to both charges. A Pretrial hearing is scheduled for 5/9/2025 at 9:00 a.m. No rights were waived in court today. There was no discussion of the client’s right to a trial within 60 days of today’s arraignment. (The 60 days will expire on 5/19/2025 – 10 days after the Pretrial hearing). 2. Client 2: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and appeared by Zoom video. The client is charged with one misdemeanor offense: (1) Driving While License Suspended Due to DUI. The client started to explain the facts of the incident but was stopped by Thomas. The client initially said that he did not understand the charges but after a brief discussion with Thomas the client confirmed that he understands the charge. The client entered a Not Guilty plea to the charge. A Pretrial hearing is scheduled for 5/9/2025 at 9:00 a.m. No rights were waived in court today. There was no discussion of the client’s right to a trial within 60 days of today’s arraignment. (The 60 days will expire on 5/19/2025 – 10 days after the Pretrial hearing). The client was given permission by the court to attend the Pretrial hearing by Zoom. 3. Client 3: Review hearing. The client is out-of-custody and appeared by Zoom video. The client has submitted proof of completion of the House Arrest and the DUI School. The client has also submitted proof of attendance at a Victim Impact Panel and monthly reports of attendance at counseling sessions. The client has also been making his monthly payments toward the fines, fees, and assessments. The court finds that the client has made good progress. The court set another review hearing for 12/18/2025 at 10:00 a.m. All that client has remaining to due is pay off the fines, fees, and assessments, and continue to attend counseling sessions. | | | |