|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | May 21, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Krishna Prasad | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy and Chelsea Mazza  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 3 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 3 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 2 |
| Hearing Types | Status and Review 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 3 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Status hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   Krishna requested a continuance to give him time to try to negotiate the case. Krishna was just recently assigned to this case. He met with his client and has good contact information for the client.  The State agreed to the continuance and explained that it also needs time to get the restitution amount and to make a settlement offer. The State asked for the next hearing to be set out 6 weeks.  Krishna informed the court that he is in trial in 6 weeks and will be out of town the following week.  The court granted the continuance and set the next Hearing for 7/23/2025 at 2:00 p.m.   1. Second Client: Sentencing hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   Krishna requested a 30-day continuance. Krishna explained to the court that the parties are trying to reach a resolution. The State agreed to the continuance. The court set the next hearing for 6/18/2025 at 2:00 p.m.  The court also granted Krishna permission to appear at the next hearing by Zoom video.   1. Third client: **Review hearing**. The client is out of custody and present in person.   Krishna explained to the court that the client has 2 remaining counseling sessions to attend and then the client’s only remaining Sentence obligation is to complete the community service. Unfortunately, the client has been unable to complete the community service because of his disability.  The court suggested that the client contact the Douglas County Chamber of Commerce for them to assist him in finding community service work that he can perform.  Krishna informed the court that he did not believe that his client can complete the community service work by the July 2025 time frame when the probation would expire. Krishna submitted the issue to the court as to whether the time frame (1 year probation) should be extended.  The court extended the jurisdiction for 1 year. The court set a Review hearing for proof of completion of the counseling sessions and the community service work for 10/22/2025 at 2:00 p.m. | | | |