|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 18, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | 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 | 0 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignments | | |
| **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?**  Mary appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Mary appeared to be knowledgeable about her 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 / Unknown |
| 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:**  Mary had two clients today:   1. Mary’s first client was scheduled for an Arraignment. The client pled guilty,pursuant to a GPA, to PCS, category E felony. State will not oppose diversion. Otherwise, 12-30 months NSP, suspended with probation, $500 fine and fees and assessments. State will not ask for a treatment program as a condition of probation. This is a mandatory diversion case (if client agrees to diversion) and a mandatory probation. The client told the court that he does not intend to seek diversion. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. PSI: ordered P&P to prepare a PSI. Sentencing: 4/1/2025 AT 9:00 a.m. 2. Mary’s second client was also scheduled for an Arraignment. However, the client did not appear in District Court. Mary informed the court that the client travels by bus and mistakenly went to the Tahoe Justice Court in Stateline, Nevada, rather than the District Court in Minden. This was the client’s first court appearance scheduled in District Court. Based on the error, the court agreed to continue the hearing 2 weeks to 3/4/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |