|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | Marc Picker | Prosecutor(s) | Aaron Russell  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 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?**  Marc appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Marc 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 / N/A |
| 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:**  Marc had one client on calendar today:   1. First client: Arraignment hearing. The client was out of custody and appeared in person.   Marc explained to the court that the District Attorney’s Office did not get the Guilty Plea Agreement to Marc until 9:00 a.m. this morning. The Guilty Plea Agreement had errors. The Guilty Plea Agreement was corrected by interlineation in court. Pursuant to negotiations, the client pled guilty to Attempted Theft of a Motor Vehicle, a category D felony. In exchange, the State will dismiss another case pending in District Court. Both sides will recommend Drug Court Diversion. The client agrees to pay restitution (if there is any). Following the court canvass, the court accepted the guilty plea as knowingly, freely and voluntarily entered.  Marc informed the court that he personally drove to Carson City, picked up the client from the Community Counseling Center’s transition living program and drove him to court this morning because Marc thought it would be important for the Judge to see the client. The client has completed the inpatient treatment program and is now over 100 days sober. The client is in the Western Regional Drug Court on the older case after having been transferred there by this court. Marc is asking the Court to place the client in the Western Regional Drug Court program on this case too. The client has full-time employment for the first time in 2 years. Marc also informed the court that according to District Attorney Pasquale, the victim is aware of this proposed outcome, has no request for restitution, and the victim is ok with sentencing occurring today in the victim’s absence.  Deputy District Attorney Russell could not confirm the victim input from the file notes. Nevertheless, the court accepted Marc’s representation and was willing to proceed to sentencing today.  The court and parties were willing to use the Presentence Investigation Report from the old case, filed on April 16, 2024. The client had no prior convictions. The client now has 1 felony conviction that he is on probation and in Drug Court.  The client made a statement of allocation: he is in the transition living program at the Community Counseling Center in Carson City, he is still receiving treatment and is doing well in Drug Court. He is currently in Intensive Outpatient treatment (approximately 90 days of intensive treatment then to be followed by less intensive outpatient counseling), he has full-time employment.  The Court granted the request for diversion.  The client had 2 other pending cases in District Court. The State dismissed one of the cases today. In the other case, not on calendar today, the client was previously sentenced for a felony offense and required to complete the Drug Court as a condition of probation. No Probation Violation has been filed in this case. | | | |