|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | May 21, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Marc Picker | Prosecutor(s) | Chelsea Mazza  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 | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Status 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?**  Marc appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Marc appeared to be knowledgeable about his case. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom 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 / 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:**  Marc had 1 client on calendar today:   1. First client: Status hearing. The client is out of custody and present by Zoom video.   Marc explained to the court that the parties had reached a resolution. Pursuant to those negotiations, the client will plead guilty to Driving Under the Influence and an amended charge of Resisting a Public Officer. However, the Criminal Complaint has 2 counts: DUI-1st and Driving on a Suspended Driver’s License. The State has not prepared an Amended Criminal Complaint in compliance with the negotiations.  The case was then trailed for the State to prepare the Amended Criminal Complaint.  When the case was recalled, the prosecutor explained to the court that she had erred with regard to the negotiations. Count 2 is not simply Driving with a Suspended Driver’s License but is actually Driving While License Suspended/Revoked Due to DUI. So, the prosecutor cannot go forward with the negotiation as the statute prohibits her from dismissing that count.  The parties agreed to continue the Status hearing for 60 days to see if a resolution can still be negotiated.  The court continued the Status hearing to 7/30/2025 at 2:00 p.m. The court also gave the client and Marc given permission to appear at the next hearing by Zoom. | | | |