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| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 29, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Thomas  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 6 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 2 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 4 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment, Status, OSC, Review 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 cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Good. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  The attorney-client communication appeared to be good, with the exception of one client Mary was unable to contact. That client did not appear also failed to appear in court today. | | | |
| **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:**  Mary had 8 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Post-Sentencing Review Hearing. The client is out-of-custody and not present.   Mary informed the court that she has been unable to contact this client. The client is homeless with no working phone. The client still owes $500 in restitution and $640 in fines, fees, and assessments.  The court issued a Bench Warrant for the client in the amount of $1,140.00. The extradition was set for the 5 Northern Nevada Counties plus El Dorado County, California.   1. Second Client: Order to Show Cause Hearing. The client is out-of-custody and not present.   Mary explained to the court that she does not know why the client is not present. Mary believes that it is simply the result of a misunderstanding. The client pled guilty to a felony charge in District court and was recently sentenced. The State requested a Bench Warrant be issued. Mary suggested that the court proceed to sentence the client in absentia (the client previously entered guilty pleas to Driving Without a Valid Driver’s License and No Insurance. The joint sentencing agreement, pursuant to the parties’ negotiations, is for a fine in each case to run concurrently with each other and no other penalty. There is sufficient cash bail to pay the fines. The State withdrew its request for a bench warrant and concurred with proceeding to sentencing the client in absentia. The court agreed and sentenced the client to concurrent fines, fees, and assessments totaling $740 to be taken from the cash bail posted. The court considered also imposing a $200 contempt penalty for failing to appear. Mary argued against the contempt finding without the client being present and having an opportunity to be heard. The court decided not to impose a contempt penalty and close out the case.   1. Third client: Arraignment. The client is in custody and present by Zoom video from the jail. Mary also appeared by Zoom video from the jail with the client. Mary informed the court that she just received a settlement offer from the state which involves 3 separate cases (only 2 of the cases are on calendar today). The offer contemplated a deferred sentencing of 6 months with conditions including restitution in the amount of $900. However, the offer was not clear whether it would require a plea to a felony or a misdemeanor. The prosecutor who made the offer was not present in court. The cases were continued for further clarification and negotiation. The next hearing is set for 5/20/2025 at 1:30 p.m. 2. Fourth client: Status hearing. The client is in custody and present by Zoom video from the jail. Mary is also appearing by Zoom video from the jail with the client. [Note: the client is out of custody on the Tahoe Justice Court case. The client is in custody on a separate felony case.] Mary informed the court that the parties had reached a resolution. Pursuant to the negotiations, the client pled guilty to count 4 Violation of a Court Order, a misdemeanor. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. Sentencing is set for 6/24/2025 at 1:30 p.m. Mary requested that the bail be revoked on this misdemeanor case so that the client could be earning credit for jail time toward the misdemeanor sentence. The court revoked the bail and remanded the client to jail on this misdemeanor charge. 3. Fifth client: Post-Sentencing Review and Order to Show Cause Hearing. The client is out-of-custody and present by Zoom video. The client owes $1,200 in fines, fees, and assessments, and failed to appear at the previous Review hearing. Mary explained that the failure to appear was the result of a communication error between herself and the client. Mary requested that her client be given a payment plan on the fine. Mary informed the court that the client believes that he can pay $200 per month until the $1,200 is paid off. The court did not find the client in contempt for the failure to appearl. The court ordered the client to pay $200 per month beginning on June 1, 2025, and continuing on the first of each month until paid in full. The client has a review date on 85/2025 at 1:30 p.m. The client should have paid $600 by that date. 4. Sixth client: Arraignment hearing. The client is in custody and present by Zoom video from the jail. Mary also appeared by Zoom video with the client from the jail. The client pled guilty, pursuant to negotiations, to Resisting a Public Officer, misdemeanor. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. The parties jointly recommended that the client be sentenced to: 60 days jail with credit for time served, the balance suspended 1 year on conditions: sobriety; stay out of all   **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from previous page):**  businesses in the casino core on Hwy 50, except for purposes of employment; search, seizure and testing for drugs, alcohol, and marijuana; violate no laws. The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation. | | | |