|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 28, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept II | Judge | Thomas Gregory |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Ence | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 2 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and 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 / N/A |
| Did the Attorney appear prepared to handle their clients' cases? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **How prepared did the Attorney appear?**  Matt appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Matt appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **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:**  Matt had 2 clients scheduled for court this morning:   1. Client 1. Review hearing. The client was out of custody and appeared by Zoom video. The hearing was to review the client’s restitution payments Matt explained that the client has experienced some financial difficulties, that she had to have surgery, and recover from that surgery. The client currently employed part-time employed but hopes to be full-time employed soon. The client is currently receiving food stamps. Through past payments the client has brought the restitution amount down to a little over $600. The client asks the court to give her additional time to pay the balance of the restitution.   The court noted that the client’s last payment was made in August 2024.  The State requests that the court require the client to show that she is actively seeking full-time employment (at least 3 applications per week).  In response the client said that she has been applying more than 3 times per week. She also has her resume listed on Indeed. As soon as she is able to pass the background check, she will have a full-time position at the Veteran’s Hospital. The client said that she will be able to pass the background in June 2025.  Order:   * The client is to submit applications for employment at a minimum of 3 times per week and submit proof to her attorney. * The client is to start making payments as soon as possible. * The client is permitted to appear at the next hearing by Zoom, as she resides in the State of Washington. Court approved client appearing at the next hearing by Zoom. * A Review Hearing shall be held on 7/28/2025 at 8:30 a.m.  1. Client 2. Arraignment hearing. The client was out of custody and present in court. Matt informed the court that he is requesting a continuance of the hearing to 6/2/2025. Matt explained that the client wants additional time to review the body camera video and other discovery documents. The State had no objection to the requested continuance. The court continued the Arraignment hearing to 6/2/2025 at 8:30 a.m.   The court inquired whether either party was requesting any change to the conditions of the client’s release from custody. Matt told the court that they were not requesting any changes. The State requested an additional condition that the client be under the supervision of the Department of Alternative Sentencing and be subject to search, seizure and testing based on this being a serious drug case.  The Court Ordered that the bail conditions remain as previously ordered by the Justice Court with one additional condition: that client appear at all future court hearings, including the continued Arraignment on 6/2/2025 at 8:30 a.m. | | | |