|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Ray Areshenko | Prosecutor(s) | Stephen Girardot  Deputy DA |
| 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 | Pretrial 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?**  Ray appeared to be as prepared as possible for court. He was just assigned to this case and expressed that he needs more time to review the discovery with the client. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Ray appeared to be as knowledgeable as possible about his case in light of just having been assigned to this 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:**  Ray had 1 client on calendar today:   1. Ray’s client had a Pretrial hearing. The client was in custody and appeared by Zoom video from the jail. The client was in custody having been arrested on a bench warrant for failing to appear at the last court hearing.   Ray argued for an O.R. release, or in the alternative, that bail be set at a much lower amount (currently it is set at approximately $6,000). Ray informed the court that the client claims that he did not know about the last court date or he would have been present. The State objected to an O.R. release. The State also objected to the bail being lowered. The State argued that it had to track the client through Washington, Idaho and Utah, before finally catching up to him and having him arrested on the warrant and extradited back to Humboldt County. The client chose to speak to inform the court that he has an opportunity to go into an inpatient treatment program next week. [Note: the client is currently serving out a sentence from 6JDC.] Order: Bail remains as previously ordered. The court said that if Judge Montero allows the client to be released to treatment, Judge Mavity will reconsider his custody status. The Preliminary hearing is set for 3/25/2025 at 2:00 p.m. (this was the earliest date due to Ray’s existing schedule).  The client did not waive his right to speedy preliminary hearing (15 days).  DDA Girardot stated that any previously extended offer is withdrawn. | | | |