|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | March 24, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Fourth Judicial District Court Dept 2 | Judge | Al Kacin |
| Defense Attorney | Stefanie Foster  Chief Deputy Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Amanda Zapata  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 | Sentencing 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?**  Stefanie appeared to be prepared for her case today. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Stefanie appeared to be knowledgeable about her case today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Stefanie did a good job advocating for her client during the court hearing. | | | |
| **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 / 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):**  Stefanie had 1 client scheduled for court this afternoon:  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes Continued from Previous Page:**  Sentencing hearing. The client was in custody and present in court. The client pled guilty to a category E felony in February 2023. The Sentencing hearing was previously scheduled for April 2023, but the client failed to appear. The client is currently seeking a deferred judgment.  Presentence Investigation Report Corrections:  The Judge corrected the Sentencing Date. The State had no corrections. Stefanie corrected the Credit for Time Served from 1 day (initial arrest) to 35 days (the client has been in custody for 34 days since his arrest on the bench warrant - February 19, 2025, through today).  Contempt issue:  Stefanie asked the court to impose a sentence of time served for contempt and no additional penalty. The State did not have any input on the contempt penalty. The court found the client in contempt for failing to appear at the original sentencing date, sentenced the client to 25 days jail for the contempt, and gave the client credit for 25 days jail.  Sentencing:  Stefanie argued in support of a deferred judgment and that the client still qualifies for a deferred judgment.  The State did not oppose the deferred judgment.  The court granted the client a deferred judgment. Order: The sentence is deferred for up to 18 months with all standard terms of probation, including supervision by the Division of Parole and Probation, and special conditions regarding drugs, alcohol, and gaming/gambling. The client shall pay restitution on a payment plan set up by Parole and Probation.  Additional notes: the client is a resident of Utah. The client was ordered released from custody today. The client plans to return to Utah where he just paroled following a 15 month prison term. The client will be under the supervision of the Utah Department of Parole and Probation. The client will need to complete the Interstate Compact paperwork in Nevada and obtain a travel pass to Utah before returning to Utah. | | | |