|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 18, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Brian Filter | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 2 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | o | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and Probation Violation | | |
| **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?**  Brian appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Brian appeared to be knowledgeable about his 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 / 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:**  Brian had two clients today:   1. Brian’s first client was scheduled for an Arraignment. The client entered a Not Guilty plea to one count of Possession of a Controlled Substance, a category E felony. The client invoked his right to a speedy trial. The trial is scheduled for March 26-27, 2025. A Motion hearing/Pretrial hearing is scheduled for March 11, 2025. All motions must be ripe for decision by the March 11 hearing. Jury instructions are due to the court by 5:00 p.m. on March 24, 2025.   Brian argued for his client’s release on his own recognizance.  The State opposed the release. The State pointed out that the client had a prior Failure to Appear in this case and a prior failure to appear for testing with the Department of Alternative Sentencing. The State also informed the Court that the client has an active warrant out of Lyon County.  The Court denied the request to change the current bail status.   1. Brian’s second client was scheduled for hearing on a Probation Violation. Brian requested a one-week continuance. Brian informed the court that he plans to argue for reinstatement on probation for his client with a condition of participation in a residential substance use treatment program. Brian needs the additional week to obtain confirmation that the client has a bed date in an inpatient program prior to the disposition on the probation violation. The State did not object to the continuance.   The hearing was continued to 2/25/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |