|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 29, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Matt Ence | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Thomas  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 4 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 4 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment, Post-Sentencing Review Hearings | | |
| **Attorney's Preparedness** | | | |
| Did the Attorney appear for court? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| Did the Attorney have the file? | | | Yes / No / Unknown |
| Did the Attorney appear to have had a substantive, confidential meeting with  each client before court? | | | Yes / No / Unknown |
| Did the Attorney appear prepared to handle their clients' cases? | | | Yes / No / N/A |
| **How prepared did the Attorney appear?**  Matt appeared prepared for court, with the exception of the last case. Matt left court before the last client’s case was called by the court. The client was not present. It appeared that Matt did not know the case was on calendar today. The court issued an Order to Show Cause on that case for 5/27/2025 at 1:30 p.m. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Matt appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases, with the exception noted above. | | | |
| **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 / Unknown |
| 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:**  Matt had 4 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. Matt informed the court that the client is scheduled to enter a 45-day inpatient treatment program at the Community Counseling Center in Carson City next week. Matt stated that the client planned to sign a release of information at the counseling center to allow the treatment center to provide information to the Department of Alternative Sentencing, the Court, and the State regarding his presence in the treatment program and the results of any/all drug and alcohol tests. Matt requested that the Arraignment be continued to 6/24/2025 at 1:30 p.m. The State did not object to the continuance. The court continued the hearing to 6/24/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 2. Second Client: Post-Sentencing Review Hearing. The client is out-of-custody and not present. This case was on the calendar for the client to show proof that he had completed the 20 days active jail required by his sentence. Matt informed the court that the client is currently in custody of the Douglas County Jail completing that 20 day jail sentence. The court confirmed with the court bailiff that the client is on the in custody list and serving out that sentence. No future court dates were set. 3. Third client: Arraignment. The client is out-of-custody and present in person. The prosecutor requested that the Arraignment be continued into June to enable the parties to potentially resolve the case prior to the Arraignment. Matt and the client agreed to the continuance. The Arraignment was continued to 6/20/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 4. Fourth client: Status hearing. The client is-out-of-custody and not present. While Matt had been in court for his other cases heard earlier this afternoon, he had left the court prior to this case being called. The prosecutor requested a bench warrant be issued for the client’s failure to appear. The court issued an Order to Show Cause instead of a bench warrant and set that hearing for 5/27/2025 at 1:30 p.m. | | | |