|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez by Zoom video |
| Date | March 13, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Union Justice Court | Senior Judge | Michael Mavity |
| Defense Attorney | Robert Dolan | Prosecutor(s) | Wendy Maddox  Deputy DA |
| 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 | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Pretrial 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?**  Robert appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Robert appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. In one case Robert had just been assigned the case 2 days ago and has not yet received the discovery. | | | |
| **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:**  Robert had 2 clients on calendar today:   1. Robert’s first client had 2 separate cases. The client was out of custody and appeared in person.  * The felony charge was amended in open court by interlineation to a misdemeanor charge of Possession of a Drug Not Lawfully Introduced into Interstate Commerce. The client pled guilty to that amended charge. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. The parties jointly recommended a sentence of time served (the client spent 23 days in jail). The court sentenced the client to pay fines, fees, and assessments totaling $1,140. The court further ordered that those fines, fees, and assessments are satisfied by the time the client already served in jail. * In the misdemeanor case, the client pled guilty to count 3 Possession of Drug Paraphernalia. The other 2 counts were dismissed. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. The parties jointly recommended a sentence of time served (the client spent 23 days in jail). The court sentenced the client to time served.  1. Robert’s second client was out of custody and appeared in person. Robert was just assigned to the case 2 days ago. Robert has not received discovery yet. The DA’s office has also not sent a settlement offer. The parties stipulated to continue today’s hearing. The client waived his right to a speedy preliminary hearing in court. The prelim set for next week 3/20/2025 is vacated. The Pretrial hearing is continued to 5/1/2025 at 10:00 a.m. | | | |