|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | March 4, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | Ninth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Nathan Tod Young |
| Defense Attorney | Mary Brown | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy  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 | 1 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment | | |
| **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 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:**  Mary had one client on this morning’s adult criminal law and motion calendar:  The client pled guilty, pursuant to the Guilty Plea Agreement, to Possession of a Controlled Substance, a category E felony. As part of the agreement the State will not oppose probation and the Client will not seek a diversion. The court asked the attorneys whether this was a mandatory probation case. The prosecutor did not know the answer. If Mary knew the answer, she did not inform the court. The court said that it would find out from the client’s history in the Presentence Investigation Report prior to sentencing. Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea. The court ordered the preparation of a Presentence Investigation report. Sentencing is scheduled for 4/22/2025 at 9:00 a.m. | | | |