|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 22, 2025 | County | Lander |
| Court | Eleventh Judicial District Court | Judge | Jim Shirley |
| Defense Attorney | Debra Amens  Lander County Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Michael MacDonald  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 | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment 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?**  Debra appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Debra appeared to be knowledgeable about her case. | | | |
| **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:**  Debra had 1 client on today’s court calendar:   1. First Client: Arraignment hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   At the beginning of the hearing, the representative from Pretrial Services informed the court that the client was unable to provide a urine sample for testing today. The court informed the parties that it was unwilling to proceed with the Arraignment without the client providing a valid test. The prosecutor recommended that the court revoke the client’s own recognizance release based on his failure to test. Debra requested that the hearing be trailed until the client could provide a urine sample for testing or in the alternative that the hearing be continued and her client remain out of custody. Debra explained to the court that her client is trying to get into an inpatient treatment program.  The court continued the Arraignment for two weeks setting the hearing on 5/6/2025 at 1:30 p.m.  The court advised Debra that if a treatment bed becomes available for the client prior to May 6, Debra is to file a Motion to Continue the Arraignment so that client may enter the treatment program. | | | |