|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | March 11, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Sixth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Michael Montero |
| Defense Attorney | Ray Areshenko | Prosecutor(s) | Wendy Maddox  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 | Disposition hearing on Probation Violations | | |
| **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?**  Ray appeared prepared for court. However, he was scheduled to appear in another court at the same time as this hearing and had not notified this court of his dual commitment prior to today’s hearing. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Kyle 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 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 / 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:**   1. Disposition Hearing: The client was in custody. When the case was first called the client was present in court. There was also a Spanish interpreter who appeared by Zoom to assist the client. However, Ray was not present. Prior to the hearing, Ray had requested and received permission to appear by Zoom. However, Ray was not present (neither in person nor by Zoom). The State informed the court that Ray’s wife may be having a baby [the expected birth/delivery date was yesterday (3/10/2025)]. A court recess was taken to see if Ray could be located. During the recess it was learned that Ray is in court in another jurisdiction and will join this court by Zoom as soon as his other hearing concludes.   The case was readdressed at 10:20 a.m. There was a discussion in the courtroom, off the record, between Ray (by Zoom), DDA Wendy Maddox in Court and Judge Montero in court, regarding whether the case should be continued or whether the client should be brought back to court from the jail. Ray informed the court that the client is only able to raise $500 toward restitution (the total restitution owed is $3,500 – the client has not made a single payment in 2 years). The attorneys and Court agreed to continue the case to 3/25/2025. The State is to contact the victim to obtain input; Ray is to confirm with the client whether $500 is all that he plans to pay.  The client is facing 364 days in jail. The client has credit for 96-days time served plus the time he is currently serving waiting for the disposition of his probation violations.  The court continued the hearing to: 3/25/2025 at 9:30 a.m.  The client’s custody status was not addressed in court. | | | |