|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Jeffrie Miller | 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 | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Competency 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?**  Jeffrie appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Jeffrie 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 court 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 / 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:**  Jeffrie had 1 case on the calendar today:   1. First client: Competency Review Hearing. The client is in custody and not present in court.   Miller was not present in court when the case was initially called at 9:10 a.m. (this case was set for 9:00 and trailed) The case was recalled at 10:00 a.m. and Jeffrie was present. Jeffrie reminded the court that at the last hearing the client was in custody in Arizona and appeared by Zoom. Today the client is still in an inpatient treatment program in Arizona and is soon to be transferred to outpatient treatment. Her attorney in Arizona is Thomas Dean. The Arizona case started as a misdemeanor criminal case but is now solely a civil commitment. She will remain under Arizona court jurisdiction for up to 365 days.  At the last hearing, the client was determined to not be competent and was ordered to be brought to restoration.  The State is requesting that this case maintain the status quo: incompetent and ordered to be brought to competency.  The court orders that the status quo continue. | | | |