|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 7, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Sixth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Michael Montero |
| Defense Attorney | Patrick Mansfield | Prosecutor(s) | Anthony Gordon  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 | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Sentencing hearing | | |
| **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?**  Patrick appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Patrick appeared to be knowledgeable about his case. | | | |
| **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 / 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:**  Patrick had one case on the court calendar today:   1. First Client: Sentencing hearing. The client was in custody and present in court.   After having been restored to competency, the client pled guilty but mentally ill to one count of Second Degree Murder (reduced from First Degree Murder). Today was the sentencing hearing. There were no corrections to the Presentence Investigation Report. Patrick filed a memorandum in support of mitigation with the court prior to today’s hearing. Patrick called the client’s mother as a witness in support of his mitigation argument. The mother testified how the client (and the rest of the family) took a downward spiral after the client’s father’s death. The client suffered from depression, got into drug use and addiction, and then recently lost her brother to a drug overdose. The mother testified that she is now raising her son’s children and the client’s 9 year old son.  The State had no evidence to present during the hearing.  6 separate people (the victim’s brother, sister, nephew, two nieces, and a family friend) made victim impact statements.  Patrick made a strong argument in mitigation, and asked for the minimum possible sentence (25 years in prison with a possibility of parole after 10 years have been served).  The State argued for the maximum possible sentence (Life in prison with the possibility of parole after 10 years have been served).  The client made a statement in allocation. She said that she was not in her right mind at the time of the offense. She knows that there is nothing she can do to bring the victim back or to make up for what she has done. She said that there is not a day that goes by that she does not think about what she has done. She has been away from her son for 4 years now and will continue to live away from him for a long period of time, if not forever.  The court pointed out that the statue only provides him with 2 sentencing options:   * 25 years prison with parole possible after 10 years, or * Life in prison with parole possible after 10 years.   The court stated that it has no ability to prevent parole or to impose any sentence other than one of the two mentioned above.  The court stated that he did not find that the client is currently mentally ill.  The court sentenced the client to the maximum possible sentence: Life in prison with the possibility of parole after 10 years have been served. The court also imposed the $25 administrative assessment fee and the $3 DNA assessment fee. The court gave the client credit for 1,422 days time served. | | | |