|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 24, 2025 | County | Pershing |
| Court | Eleventh Judicial District Court | Judge | Jim Shirley |
| Defense Attorney | Steven Cochran  Pershing County Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Bryce Shields, District Attorney  Paul Yohey, 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 | 1 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 5 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment, Sentencing, Review, | | |
| **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?**  Steven appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Steven 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 / 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:**  Steven had 6 cases today.   1. First Client: Sentencing hearing on a gross misdemeanor offense. The client was out of custody and present in person. The Presentence Investigation Report was waived. Cochran made a sentencing argument in mitigation and in support of the joint sentencing recommendation contained in the Guilty Plea Agreement previously filed with the court. The State recommended that the court follow the joint sentencing recommendation as contained in the Guilty Plea Agreement which included 20 days of active jail and 344 days of suspended jail on each of two counts to run concurrently. The court imposed the following sentence:  * $25 Administrative Assessment fee, $3 DNA fee. * Count I: 364 days jail with credit for time served of 2 days. The balance of the jail time is suspended for 1 year with standard terms of probation to be supervised by the Division of Parole and Probation. * Count 2: Same as Count 1 to run concurrently.  1. Second Client: Review hearing prior to the sentencing hearing. The client was in custody and present in court. The sentencing hearing is scheduled for 3/24/2025. The State confirmed today that there will be no request for restitution. The parties stipulated to the release of client on her own recognizance with conditions that she immediately:  * Enroll in the Drug Court program * Obtain a Substance Use Evaluation * Participate in the Drug Court program, and * Comply with all conditions of the Drug Court program.   Order: The client is released on her own recognizance with the conditions listed above.   1. Third Client: Review hearing regarding a Petition for Honorable Discharge from Probation. The client was out of custody and not present in court. The State did not object to the Petition. The court granted the petition and ordered that the client be Honorably Discharged from probation. 2. Fourth Client: Review hearing. The client is out of custody and not present in court. Steven moved to withdraw from representation of this client due to a conflict of interest. The motion was granted. The hearing is continued 2 weeks for Nevada DIDS to be notified and to assign new indigent defense counsel. 3. Fifth Client: Review hearing regarding a Petition for Honorable Discharge from Probation. The client was out of custody and not present in court. The State did not object to the Petition. The court granted the petition and ordered that the client be Honorably Discharged from probation. The court further ordered that all outstanding fees and assessments are converted to a civil judgment against the client. 4. Sixth Client: Arraignment. The client is out of custody but not present in court. Steven represented to the court that he did not know why his client was not present. Steven stated that his client has been in contact with his office and that it is not like her to not appear. Steven requested a 2-week continuance. The State did not object to the request for a continuance. The court granted the 2-week continuance. | | | |