|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DIDS Attorney Observation Report** | | **Reviewer** | Derrick Lopez |
| Date | May 21, 2025 | County | Douglas |
| Court | East Fork Justice Court | Judge | Laurie Trotter |
| Defense Attorney | Brian Filter | Prosecutor(s) | William Murphy and Heidi Remick  Deputy District Attorney |
| Attorney Present | In Person / Virtual / w/Client | Number of Clients | 8 |
| Defendants Present | In Person / Virtual / Off-Site | Custodial Status | IC / OOC / Blend |
| Number of Clients  In custody | 0 | Number of Clients Out-of-Custody | 8 |
| Cases Continued  In Custody | 0 | Cases Continued  Out-of-Custody | 5 |
| Hearing Types | Status, Sentencing, Restitution, Order to Show Cause, 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?**  Brian appeared prepared for court. | | | |
| **How knowledgeable was the Attorney about their cases?**  Brian 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:**  Brian had 8 clients on calendar today:   1. First client: Status hearing. The client is out of custody and present by Zoom video.   Brian requested a 2 week continuance. Brian informed the court that the parties have reached a resolution of the cases. However, the State needs time to prepare the Amended CC. The court granted the continuance. The court also granted the client permission to appear by Zoom at the next hearing on 6/4/2025 at 2:00 p.m.   1. Second client: Sentencing hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   Brian requested a continuance. Brian informed the court that the settlement negotiations require a mental health evaluation of the client. The client has recently participated in a mental health evaluation but has not received the written report. Brian also requested that his client, who is living in Southern California, be permitted to appear by Zoom video at the next hearing. The court granted the continuance and gave the client permission to appear by Zoom video at the next hearing on 6/4/2025 at 2:00 p.m.  Note: client was sentenced in District Court yesterday and received probation.   1. Third client: Restitution hearing. The client is out of custody and present by Zoom video.   This was a post-sentencing review regarding payment of restitution. The client paid $250 in February, and another $100 yesterday. No other payments have been made.  Brian explained to the court that the client is still unemployed. He has raised money restitution money so far by giving Plasma. The client lives in Reno and has no vehicle. The client has applied for disability. The client believes that he can pay $100 per month.  The court ordered the client to pay at least $100/month and set another review hearing for 8/20/2025. The court granted the client permission to appear at the next review hearing by Zoom video.   1. Fourth client: Status hearing. The client is out of custody and present by Zoom video.   Brian requested a continuance. Brian explained to the court that his client needs to obtain a Substance Use Evaluation as part of the resolution being discussed with the State. The client met with the evaluator for the evaluation but does not have the written report yet.  The court continued the hearing to 6/11/2025 at 2:00 p.m. The court granted the client permission to appear at the next hearing by Zoom video.   1. Fifth client: Post-Sentence Review hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   The client paid the fine today. The Victim Impact Panel has been completed, the DUI school completed, and the 48 hours of community service work has been completed. So, all active sentence conditions are now completed.   1. Sixth client: Order to Show Cause hearing. The client is out of custody and not present.   The client Failed to Appear at the last hearing. Brian informed the court that he has not been able to reach the client. The State informed the court that it is not request a bench warrant. Instead, the State asked the court to set another Order to Show Cause hearing and give Brian more time to contact his client. The court set another Order to Show Cause hearing for 6/25/2025 at 2:00 p.m.   1. Seventh client: Post-Sentence Review hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   Brian explained to the court that his client needs more time to complete the sentencing requirements. Brian explained that the client’s brother was injured in a serious car accident (broken back) and she has been providing care for him. Brian asked for a 2-month continuance. The State did not object to the continuance. The next review hearing was set for 7/25/2025 at 9:00 a.m.  **Remarks/Recommendations/Notes (continued from the previous page):**   1. Eighth client: Review Hearing. The client is out of custody and present in person.   The client is on a deferred sentencing. The client was required to obtain a Substance Use Evaluation. Brian informed the court that the client has obtained the evaluation and provided the evaluation to the court during the hearing. Brian informed the court that the evaluation recommends that the client participate in inpatient treatment. However, the client does not believe inpatient treatment is necessary and asked the court to allow her to participate in Intensive Outpatient treatment rather than inpatient treatment. The client plans to do the Intensive Outpatient treatment with the Community Counseling Center in Carson City. The State does not object to the client participating in outpatient treatment. The court granted the client permission to participate in Intensive Outpatient treatment in lieu of inpatient treatment. The court set a Review in 2 weeks, 6/11/2025 at 2:00 p.m., to show proof of enrollment in the Community Counseling Center’s Intensive Outpatient Treatment program. | | | |