|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | April 8, 2025 | County | Humboldt |
| Court | Sixth Judicial District Court Dept I | Judge | Michael Montero |
| Defense Attorney | Krishna Prasad | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Russell  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 | 2 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 2 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 0 |
| Hearing Types | Arraignment and Probation Violation 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?**  Krishna appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Krishna 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:**  Krishna had 2 clients on calendar today:   1. First Client: Arraignment and hearing on Allegations that client violated the terms of his release. The client is in custody and present by Zoom video from the jail.   Evidentiary Hearing on Allegation of Violation of Conditions of Release:  The State called 2 witnesses:   * Denni Bird, Pretrial Services Officer/Indigent Assistant/Public Guardian:   When the client was released from custody, one of the conditions was that he immediately meet with Pretrial Services and be set up to wear a Global Positioning System Monitoring Device. Denni Bird observed the client walking away from the Pretrial Services Office without getting the monitor. Denni Bird directed the client back to the office where the GPS Monitor ankle bracelet was placed on him. The next day she received notice that the device had been tampered with. The monitoring service located the ankle bracelet and the device had been tampered with. The monitoring service located the ankle bracelet in the apartment where the client said he was residing. The client was not present when the device was located in the apartment. The device had been removed as the client was not wearing the device.  No cross-examination by the defense.   * Deputy Casey Negus (Sgt with Alamo County Sheriff’s Office):   Testified that he had been dispatched to a residence of Samantha Bradshaw that had been condemned as a result of a fire. Deputy Negus located the client in the condemned residence. Deputy Negus arrested the client on the warrant for violating the terms of his conditions of release. The client was not wearing the GPS ankle bracelet monitor at the time of his arrest.  Cross-examination:  Krishna confirmed from the witness that the client was arrested solely for the violation of bail conditions and for no new crime.  The State argued for revocation of bail release.  Krishna argued that revocation is not appropriate. Krishna explained that the client is on a mandatory diversion. The ankle bracelet was ordered due to the client missing a court date. The client did not know about the court date because counsel was unable to notify the client of the new court date. So, in essence, the violation leading to the ankle bracelet was for the client’s failure to maintain good contact information with his attorney.  The Arraignment was also scheduled for today. However, the DA’s Office has not yet prepared the GPA.  The court ordered the Arraignment hearing shall be continued to tomorrow at 9:30 a.m.  The court found that the State has shown probable cause the client violated his terms of release. The court imposed a consequence of time served for the violation and re-released the client on his own recognizance with the original conditions of release.  The client told court that upon his release he planned to take care of an elderly person. The court ordered that he is not to provide caretaking for an elderly person between today and tomorrow’s court hearing. The elder care situation can be discussed further at tomorrow’s court hearing.  The client is ordered to appear in person in court tomorrow morning 4/9/2025 at 9:30 a.m.   1. Second client: Arraignment hearing. The client is in custody and present in court by Zoom video from the jail.   The State requested that the Arraignment be continued. This case was originally handled by Deputy District Attorney Evans. She is no longer with the office. The case is now transferred to District Attorney Pasquale. DA Pasquale was out last week, is out today, and may be out more days this week.  Krishna responded stating that this was a carefully negotiated and resolved with Deputy District Attorney Evans. The Guilty Plea Agreement has been signed by the client and Prasad. Krishna expressed that he does not understand why this case needs to be delayed.  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from previous page):**  The court suggested that the case be continued to tomorrow at 9:30 a.m.  Both parties agreed to a one day continuance. The court ordered the Arraignment to be continued to tomorrow, 4/9/2025, at 9:30 a.m. | | | |