|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Massey Mayo | Prosecutor(s) | Stephen Girardot  Deputy DA |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 9 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 3 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 6 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 2 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Hearing Types | Pretrial hearings, Review hearing, Motion to Continue Preliminary 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?**  Massey appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Massey appeared to be knowledgeable about her cases. | | | |
| **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:**  Massey had 6 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Review hearing. The client was in custody and present in court. Massey explained to the court that the client recently pled guilty but mentally ill in District Court in another case. Pursuant to negotiations, in exchange for that guilty plea, the State moved to dismiss the 2 cases on calendar today in the justice court. The court ordered the 2 cases dismissed. 2. Second client: Pretrial hearing. The client was out of custody and present in court. The State moved to dismiss this case because the State cannot find the victim. The court dismissed the case. 3. Third client: Pretrial hearing. The client was out of custody and present in court. Pursuant to negotiations, these 3 cases are being deferred until November 6, 2025, on the condition that the client not violate any laws. The client will remain on the pretrial services bail conditions until November 6, 2025, pursuant to the negotiations. Next Hearing: 11/6/2025 at 9:00 a.m. 4. Fourth client: Pretrial hearing. The client was out of custody and not present in court. The State requests a bench warrant based upon the client’s failure to appear. The client failed to appear last week as well. An Order to Show Cause was not issued. The case was simply continued to this week. Massey argued for the court to issue an Order to Show Cause rather than a Bench Warrant. Mayo informed the court that she does not have good contact information for the client, but she will work on trying to find him and get him into court. The client is on Pretrial Services supervision. Pretrial Services will assist Mayo to get in touch with the client. The court continued the hearing to 4/10/2025 at 10:00 a.m. 5. Fifth client: Pretrial hearing. The client was out of custody and not present in court. The client appeared earlier this morning. He is very ill. So, he was sent home. The court continued the hearing to 3/27/2024 at 11:00 a.m. 6. Sixth client: Pretrial hearing. The client was out of custody and present in court. Pursuant to negotiations, the case is being deferred to July 5, 2025, on conditions of no new criminal offenses. If successful, the charges will be dismissed. Review for dismissal on July 3, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. 7. Seventh client: Pretrial hearing. The client was in custody and present by Zoom video from the jail.   Massey was assigned to this case 2 days ago. Massey has not received any discovery from the State yet. The parties stipulated to recommend that the client be released from jail on his own recognizance. The parties further stipulated to continue the pretrial hearing. The client waived his right to a speedy preliminary hearing in open court (written waiver to follow). Order: the client is released on his Own Recognizance with no supervision from Pretrial Services. The Pretrial hearing is continued to 4/10/2025 at 9:00 a.m.   1. Eighth client: Pretrial hearing. The client was out of custody and present in court.   The client has 2 cases currently set for preliminary hearing this afternoon. The cases are not from the same event/time frame. The defense has not received the transcript of the telephonic search warrant, nor the body camera video of the officers (who allegedly obtained an admission from the client), even though requested by the defense. Mayo moved to continue the preliminary hearing. Girardot initially agreed to continue the preliminary hearing. However, the State now opposes the continuance of the preliminary hearing. Since verbally agreeing to the continuance, Girardot learned that all his witnesses were served with subpoenas and that one of the witnesses canceled numerous medical appointments because of the subpoena. The court continued the Preliminary Hearing to April 17, 2025, at 1:15 p.m.   1. Ninth client: Pretrial hearing. The client was in custody and not present in court. These cases have been trailing a District Court case. The parties stipulate to continue these hearings to5/15//2025 at 10:00 a.m. **The court continued the h**earing **to** 5/15/2025 at 10:00 a.m. | | | |