|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 24, 2025 | County | Elko |
| Court | Fourth Judicial District Court Dept 1 | Judge | Kriston Hill |
| Defense Attorney | Jamie Martinez | Prosecutor(s) | Daniel Roche  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 1 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In Custody | 1 | Number of Clients  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and Order to Show Cause | | |
| **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?**  Jamie did not appear to be prepared for her case today. While Jamie had prepared the Guilty Plea Agreement timely, the GPA had an error regarding the category of the offense. It had the penalty range correct, but the wrong category for the offense. Additionally, the GPA was missing the “Certificate of Counsel” as required by statute. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Jamie appeared to be knowledgeable about her case today. | | | |
| **The Attorney's courtroom advocacy skills were:**  Diana did a good job advocating for her client during the court hearing. | | | |
| **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 / Unknown |
| 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 (continued from reverse side):**  Jamie had one client on calendar today scheduled for a Continued Arraignment. The client was in custody and present in person. Jamie failed to appear at the previous Arraignment date. Consequently, today’s hearing was also scheduled for an Order to Show Cause why Jamie should not be held in contempt for failing to appear.  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes Continued from Previous Page:**  Order to Show Cause**:** Jaime explained that she had received the court’s permission to appear at the original Arraignment hearing by Zoom. Jamie said that she was on the Court’s Zoom site and waited for the “host” to log her in. However, the host never let her into the Zoom court hearing. Judge Hill accepted that explanation and did not finding Jamie in contempt. However, Judge Hill also stated that she is not aware of this ever happening in her court before, that other people were able to appear by Zoom on that date, and that the court clerks indicated that they never saw Jamie on the Zoom link.  Arraignment: The Guilty Plea Agreement had an error regarding the category of the felony charge. The offense was a category C felony as indicated in the Information and not a category B felony as indicated in the GPA. The GPA was also missing the Certification of Counsel. The GPA was prepared by Jamie. Jamie informed the court that she had never prepared a GPA before, that she practices primarily in Clark County, and in Clark County the District Attorney’s Office prepares the GPA. Jamie stated that she had never done a Certificate of Counsel for a GPA before. The Judge responded that it is required by NRS. Judge Hill gave Jamie the NRS statute (174.063) and informed Jamie that there is a sample Certificate of Counsel in the statute that she can use. The hearing was continued to 3/3/2025 to enable Jamie to prepare an Amended and corrected GPA to include a Certificate of Counsel. | | | |