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| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 21, 2025 | County | Pershing |
| Court | Eleventh Judicial District Court | Judge | Jim Shirley |
| Defense Attorney | Steve Cochran  Pershing County Public Defender | Prosecutor(s) | Bryce Shields  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 | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 4 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment, 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?**  Steve appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Steve 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 / Unknown |
| 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:**  Steve had 4 clients on today’s court calendar:   1. First Client: Motion hearing. The client is out-of-custody and present in person.   Steve filed a Motion to Withdraw Guilty plea based upon the negotiations contained in the Guilty Plea Agreement and the client’s successful completion of probation. The State stipulated to the client having complied with the terms of the agreement. Consequently, the client is entitled to withdraw his plea to the felony charge and enter a guilty plea to a lesser offense, a gross misdemeanor. Pursuant to the negotiations, the parties will jointly recommend that the client be sentenced to time served.  The court ordered that the guilty plea to the felony charge is withdrawn. The client then entered a guilty plea to a gross misdemeanor offense of “House Breaking.” Following court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea to the gross misdemeanor. The court followed the joint sentencing recommendation and sentenced the client to time served.   1. Second Client: Arraignment hearing. The client is out-of-custody and present in person.   The client pled not guilty to 2 counts of Assault with a Deadly Weapon, both category B felonies. The client also pled not guilty to 2 counts of Battery on a Law Enforcement Officer, both gross misdemeanor offenses. The client waived his right to a speedy trial. The parties requested that a settlement conference be set in approximately 60 days. Steve informed the court that additional investigation needs to be completed prior to the settlement conference. The court stated that it would set a settlement conference date a little over 60 days from today. Future court hearings will be set through the judicial assistant and/or court clerks.   1. Third Client: Arraignment hearing. The client is out-of-custody and present in person.   In addition to the Arraignment the court stated that there were allegations that the client has tested positive for controlled substances in violation of his conditions of release that needed to be addressed. The court conducted a brief canvass of the client, confirming that the client was satisfied with the services of his attorney (Steve), that they had discussed the case and possible defenses, that they were prepared for today’s hearing, and that the client previously waived his right to a preliminary hearing freely and voluntarily. The client waived a formal reading of the Information. Before continuing with the entry of plea pursuant to the negotiations and Guilty Plea Agreement, a representative of Pretrial Services informed the court and the parties that the client tested this morning before court and that the result was presumptively positive for methamphetamine. Based on the presumptive positive test, Steve requested that the Arraignment be continued to the next Law and Motion Calendar (2-weeks from today). The State agreed with the requested continuance but asked the Court to remand the client into custody pointing out that this was the client’s 4th dirty test with Pretrial Services between his release and today. The State also pointed out that this is the second hearing that client has appeared and tested positive for controlled substances. Steve argued for his client to remain out of custody emphasizing that the client does appear for his court hearing and appears coherent. The court ordered that the client’s pretrial release is revoked and that the client is remanded into custody. The client asked if he can turn himself in in two weeks after his doctor appointment and his court hearing in Winnemucca next week.  The court ordered Lovelock Sheriff’s Office to transport the client to his doctor appointment (scheduled in Lovelock). The court also instructed the court clerk to notify Humboldt County that the client is in custody in Pershing County so that the Humboldt County Court will be aware that client is not able to personally attend in Winnemucca at his court hearing next week. The Arraignment was continued to 5/5/2025 at 9:00 a.m.  / / /  / / /  / / /  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from previous page):**   1. Fourth Client: Review hearing. The client is out-of-custody and not present in court.   Steve informed the court that the parties had resolved the case through the Settlement Conference. However, the client not present in court today because:   * she started a new job, * she is in the 90-day probationary period of the new job, * she will lose her job if she were to miss work to attend court today, * pursuant to the settlement conference resolution, the parties stipulated to the client not appearing in court today and that the parties would jointly request that the next hearing be scheduled for after the client’s 90 day probationary period expired.   The court continued today’s hearing to 5/19/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |