|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 1, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Thomas Gregory for Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | Chelsea Mazza  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 | Sentencing 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?**  Mary appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Mary 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 / N/A |
| 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:**  Mary had 1 adult client scheduled for court this morning:   1. Client 1. Sentencing hearing. The client was out of custody and did not appear. Mary explained that the co-defendant was scheduled for sentencing yesterday. The client and co-defendant were traveling together from the Bay area. They were on their way to yesterdays’ hearing, but California Highway Patrol turned them back at the Western side of the Sierras because they did not have chains for their tires and the snowy road conditions required chains. On their way back down the mountain their car was struck by another car. The co-defendant’s judge granted a 1 week continuance. Mary is asking that this case also be continued 1 week. The State had no objection to the continuance but asks that it be an OSC as well. Pursuant to discussion and agreement, this case will be heard next week in Department II on 4/7/2025 at 8:30 a.m. along with the co-defendant. Next week’s hearing will also be an OSC regarding the FTA today. | | | |