|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 30, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Max Stovall | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy, Chelsea Mazza, and Ric Casper  Deputy District Attorney |
| 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 | 2 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Status 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?**  Max appeared prepared for court to the extent possible. Matt had not received the discovery or a settlement offer from the State in one of his cases. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Max 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:**  Max had 3 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Status hearing. The client is in custody and present in person. Matt requested a 1-week continuance because he has not yet received discovery from the State or a settlement offer. The State agrees to the 1-week continuance. The court continued the hearing to 5/7/2025 at 1:30 p.m. The client’s custody status was not addressed during today’s hearing. 2. Second Client: Status hearing. The client is out-of-custody on this case. However, the client is currently in custody in Washoe County on an unrelated case. The client is not present in court here today. This court already has a bench warrant in place for the arrest of the client. That bench warrant shall remain in place. No court date will be set until the client appears on the bench warrant or posts bail on the warrant. 3. Third client: Status hearing. The client is incustody and present in person. The parties have been unable to reach an agreement and requested that a preliminary hearing be scheduled. The parties estimated that 2 days would be needed for the preliminary hearing (note: Matt Stermitz is co-counsel with Max on this case). The earliest 2 consecutive days the court has available for a preliminary hearing is 8/14-15/2025. Note: the client has previously waived her right to a speedy preliminary hearing. The parties agree to the 8/14-15/2025 dates. | | | |