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| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 1, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Thomas Gregory for Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Max Stovall | Prosecutor(s) | Chelsea Mazza  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 2 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 1 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 1 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and Sentencing 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?**  Max appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Max 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 / 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:**  Max had 2 clients scheduled for court this morning:   1. Client 1. Sentencing hearing. The client was out of custody and appeared by Zoom. Max filed a request this morning for his client to appear by video at this hearing. The State has no objection to her appearing by Zoom. The client, unfortunately, is on the zoom link for the East Fork Justice Court instead of the District Court. The court trailed the case so that Max can inform his client that she is on the wrong court video link and provide her with the correct video link for Department II.   When the case was recalled and the client was present by Zoom video, the representative of the Department of Parole and Probation asked the court to continue the hearing for one week and to require that the client appear in person. The reason for this request is that if the court places the client on probation, the client cannot lawfully go (or be) in California without a travel pass (interstate compact). The client needs to appear in person at the Nevada Parole and Probation office to complete the paperwork to apply for Interstate Compact Supervision and to receive a travel pass to California while her application for Interstate Compact Supervision is being processed and approved/rejected.  Both the State and defense request that Sentencing occur today with the client appearing by Zoom. They asked the court to order that the client meet with Parole and Probation to obtain a travel pass within 7 days when the roads are clear (weather/snow). Max reminded the court that the client is currently residing in a sober living establishment in California. The Court finds good cause to proceed with sentencing.  Presentence Investigation Report corrections: The State had 1 correction: updating the sentencing date to today’s date. Max had 1 correction/explanation. The report states that the client had 2 prior prison sentences. Max pointed out that the client was sentenced on 2 counts to concurrent prison sentences. So, there was only 1 actual prison sentence.  The court asked the State whether there would be Victim Impact Statement. The prosecutor said no. All the stolen property was returned and no restitution is being requested.  The court informed the parties that it intends to follow the negotiations.  Max responded that in light of Court indicating that it will follow the agreement, the defense will not make any additional argument in support of the agreement.  The State recommended that the court follow the agreement.  The client waived the right of allocation.  Sentence: (followed the parties agreement contained in the GPA):   * $25 administrative assessment fee, $150 DNA fee, $3 DNA assessment fee, and $500 fine. All fines, fees, and assessments due within 6 months of completing the residential program. * 12-30 months NSP suspended and placed on probation not to exceed 24 months. (CTS 34 days)   Conditions of Probation:   * Successfully complete the sober living program that she is currently participating in and follow any/all aftercare recommendations from the sober living program. * Obtain and maintain full-time employment upon release from the sober living program. * Not possess or consume and controlled substance, alcohol, or marijuana. * Be subject to search, seizure, and testing for the presence of controlled substances, alcohol, and/or marijuana. * Comply with all standard conditions of probation.   Call P & P today to set up the Interstate Compact and Travel Pass arranged. The client was provided the phone number for Nevada Parole and Probation during the court hearing (775-684-2605).   1. Client 2. Arraignment hearing. The client was in custody and appeared in person. Max requested that the Arraignment be continued to next week to occur in front of Judge Young next week. There are negotiations that the client will be accepting, but next week – not today. Max also filed a motion for the client’s release on his Own Recognizance. The matter is fully briefed (motion, opposition, and reply) and ripe for decision. Max explained that the client is seeking a release from jail in order to enter an inpatient treatment program Alternatively Max is asking the court to allow his client to attend the inpatient program on an “out count basis” from the jail. Max informed the court that the client does not have a bed date yet. The client has been   **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from previous page):**  accepted into the Community Counseling Center’s residential treatment facility in Carson City, but no bed date has been provided yet. The State argued in opposition to the release based on the client’s previous failures to appear in this case. It was the client’s failures to appear that resulted in the bench warrant being issued and the client being placed back into custody. The State also pointed out that the underlying charge is a serious one. The client is charged with selling controlled substances out of a hotel room right next to an elementary school.  Order:   * Arraignment continued to next Tuesday in Department I. * The Motion for an Own Recognizance release is denied. Bail shall remain as previously set by the Justice Court. * This court adds a condition that should the client bail out that he is ordered to appear in court for his Arraignment hearing on 4/9/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |