|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 9, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Union Justice Court | Judge | Michael Mavity |
| Defense Attorney | Robert Dolan | Prosecutor(s) | Wendy Maddox  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 3 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 1 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Review and Motion 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?**  Robert appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Robert appeared to be knowledgeable about his cases. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Good. | | | |
| **How was the Attorney/client communication?**  I was unable to form an opinion regarding the attorney-client communication from today’s hearing. | | | |
| **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:**  Robert had 3 clients on calendar today:  [Note: the court hearing was scheduled to start at 1:15 p.m. However, Robert did not arrive in court until !:30 p.m.]   1. First client: Review hearing. The client was out of custody and not present in court.   The client owes restitution in the amount of $420.66.  Dolan informed the court that he has not heard from client recently. The client had been released from custody at the last hearing. The client was under the supervision of Pretrial Services. There was no representative present from Pretrial Services present at the hearing. So, the court did not have any information on how the client is doing. The client has made no restitution payments.  The parties stipulated to continue this hearing to give Dolan an opportunity to try and locate the client and have him appear in court at the next hearing.   1. Second client: Review hearing. The client was in custody and not present in court.   Robert informed the court that this case is trailing a felony case in District Court. The sentencing in District Court is 4/29/2025. This is a misdemeanor case to be dismissed after the client is sentenced on the felony.  Continue this hearing to May 7, 2025 at 1:15 p.m.   1. Third client: Motion hearing. The client was out of custody and not present in court. This case was not initially on calendar this morning. The case is set for later today as a preliminary hearing. The State filed amotion to continue the preliminary hearing based upon the unavailability of 2 State witnesses. Robert does not object to the continuance. The client previously waived his right to a preliminary hearing within 15 days. The court continued the preliminary hearing from Friday, April 11, 2025, to Friday, July 18, 2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |