|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | May 21, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy  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 | 1 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Hearing Types | Status, Motion, and Sentencing 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, except that Mary has not yet spoken with one of her clients that she was just recently assigned to represent. That client has an active bench warrant and did not appear for 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 4 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Status hearing. The client is in custody and present in person.  * The client pled guilty to Driving Under the Influence. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. * Mary argued for her client’s release on her Own Recognizance. Mary explained that the client needs to obtain a Substance Use Evaluation and plans to enter an inpatient treatment program at the Community Counseling Center in Carson City. * The State did not oppose the O.R. release, provided it included conditions of release: supervision by the Department of Alternative Sentencing; no controlled substances, alcohol, or marijuana; search, seizure, and testing for the presence of controlled substances, alcohol, and/or marijuana; and, violate no laws. * The Court expressed concern to the client that if released the client may drink herself to death (extremely high BAC). The court was considering requiring the client to wear and alcohol monitoring device, which would cost the client $4 per day. * Order: the client is release on O.R. with DAS supervision, sobriety, search, seizure, and testing, not consume any controlled substances (except prescription medications – however, no prescription narcotic medication), alcohol, marijuana, DAS has discretion to include transdermal device, no driving without a valid license, insurance, and registration. The client shall appear in court every Friday at 9:00 a.m. between now and the sentencing hearing so the Court can see the client is ok. Sentencing was scheduled for 6/4/2025 at 2:00 p.m.  1. Second Client: Sentencing hearing. The client is out of custody and present by Zoom video.  * Pursuant to the negotiations of the parties, the client previously pled guilty to 2 misdemeanor counts of Disorderly Conduct. As part of the negotiations, the parties jointly recommend that the client be sentenced to 32 days jail with 30 of those days suspended for 1 year. The 2 days active jail may be converted to 48 hours of community service work. The 30 days jail would be suspended on conditions that include payment of $640 in fine, fees and assessments, restitution in the amount of $553.25 (jointly and severally with the codefendant), no contact with the victims, stay away from the Buckaroos business establishment, and violate no laws. The parties recommended an identical sentence for count 2 and that the 2 sentences run concurrently. * The State informed the court that there would be no victim impact statement. * Sentence: the court followed the joint sentencing recommendation. * The court set a Review hearing for 8/22/2025 at 9:00 a.m. The client was given permission to attend the Review hearing by Zoom video.  1. Third client: Status hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   Based upon the negotiations of the parties and the client’s guilty plea in District Court, the State filed a motion to dismiss the remaining charges today (counts 3, 4, 5, 6). The East Fork Justice Court case is now closed.   1. Fourth client: Motion hearing. The client is out of custody and not present.  * Mary informed the court that she was just recently assigned to the case and she has not had contact with the client yet. * Mary requested a 1-week continuance. * Note: there is an active Bench Warrant for the client. The prior defense attorney filed a motion to quash the warrant. State opposed the motion. Today was scheduled to be the hearing on the motion to quash the warrant. * The court continued the motion hearing for 1 week to 6/4/2025 at 2:00 p.m. | | | |