|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | February 18, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Tahoe Justice Court | Judge | Michael Johnson |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | Kallie Nelson  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 | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Order to Show Cause and Status 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. | | | |
| **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:**  Mary had 4 clients on calendar today:   1. First Client: Order to Show Cause / Status Hearing. This client is Out-of-Custody and appeared in person. Regarding the OSC, Mary explained to the court that the client missed the last hearing because the client mis-calendared the court date. The client has been in regular communication with Mary. The client lives in Oregon and traveled to the Tahoe Justice Court for today’s hearing. Mary informed the court that the parties are very close to a resolution. Mary requested that the Status hearing be continued for 2 weeks and that her client not be found in contempt. The court did not find the client in contempt and continued the Status hearing for 3/4/2025. The court authorized the client to appear by Zoom at the next hearing. 2. Second Client: Status Hearing. This client is In-Custody and appeared by Zoom. Mary informed the court that the parties had reached a resolution. The client would be waiving his right to a Preliminary Hearing, will enter a guilty plea in District Court to one count of High Level Possession of a Controlled Substance, a category B felony, with a joint sentencing recommendation of 2-8 years active prison. There was no argument regarding custody status today pursuant to the negotiations. The court accepted the clients waiver of his right to a Preliminary Hearing and bound the case over to the District Court with an Arraignment hearing scheduled for March 10, 2025, at 8:30 a.m. 3. Third Client: Status Hearing. This client is Out-of-Custody and appeared by Zoom. This case is trailing a felony case already bound over to District Court. The client has pled guilty in District Court. This case was continued 2 weeks to 3/4/2025. 4. Fourth Client: Status Hearing. This client is Out-of-Custody and appeared in person. Spanish Interpreter Patty Bisbee was present to assist the client. The parties reached a resolution. The client agreed to waive her right to a Preliminary Hearing and to enter a guilty plea to two counts of Theft. The State agrees not to oppose probation. Following a canvass of the client, the court accepted the waiver of Preliminary Hearing and bound the case over to District Court. The Arraignment in District Court was scheduled for March 25, 2025, at 9:00 a.m. | | | |