IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

2

1

3

IN THE MATTER OF THE REVIEW OF

REPRESENTATION OF INDIGENT

DEFENDANTS IN CRIMINAL AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CASES,

ISSUES CONCERNING

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

desire to plead guilty

ECEIVED

MAR 14 2008

TRACIE K. LINDEMAN
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
DEPUTY CLERK

ADKT No. 411

MAR 14 2008

TRAZIE K INDEMAN
CLERIFOF SUPREME COURT
BY CHEF DEPUTY CLERK

To: Tracie K. Lindeman, Clerk of the Supreme Court, 201 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada 89701

Written Comments Submitted By Sally Loehrer, District Court Judge, Department 15, Eighth Judicial District Court

While this writer applauds the efforts and the intentions of the Indigent Defense Committee, I am concerned there are many unintended, negative consequences which will stem from adoption of the NEVADA INDIGENT DEFENSE STANDARDS OF PERFORMANCE. Some of these unintended consequences are listed below.

- Indigent defendants will be held days or weeks longer in a detention facility
 than those persons whom are able to privately retain counsel due to Standard 7
 (a) and (b) page 29 of Exhibit A to ADKT 411 which states in pertinent part:
- (a) ".....The duty to investigate exists regardless of the accused's admissions or statements to defense counsel of facts constituting guilt or the accused's stated desire to plead guilty."

- 4. attempt to locate all potential witness and have them interviewed;"
 The defendant with privately retained counsel will be allowed to negotiate his/her case the first day it appears before a magistrate/justice/judge and be released from custody as soon as a plea is entered while the indigent defendant will be required to sit in jail until precious little resources are spread over literally thousands of indigent defendants in an effort to "locate all witnesses and.." interview them.
- 2) The justice system as it now operates in Las Vegas Justice Court, Clark County Nevada, clears (resolves) upwards of 90% of its misdemeanor cases at the initial arraignment. None of the indigent portion of these persons would be allowed to resolve his/her case on that first Court appearance. Multiple court appearances will double or triple the number of cases before a given judge on every court date. Arraignment calendars will last 2 to 3 times longer than they do today. Courts will have much less time to conduct felony/gross misdemeanor preliminary hearings and misdemeanor and civil trials due to the geometric expansion of the arraignment calendars.
- 3) Felony and gross misdemeanor cases which are resolved at early negotiation on or before the date set for preliminary hearing may no longer be so resolved. Instead, thousands more witnesses will be required to attend court and testify at a preliminary hearing while the indigent defendant sits in jail at a daily cost to the citizenry of Clark County of about \$120 per day per inmate. The capacity of all local jails will be reached, breached and exceeded within two weeks of implementation of these standards.

- 4) Timely processing of all criminal cases will be adversely affected. While there should never be a rush to judgment, the Court system should not erect barriers to the speedy administration of justice. This writer sees little benefit to the indigent defendant of requiring his attorney to personally or thru an investigator locate and contact witnesses and conduct other investigation prior to the entry of a plea in any situation where the attorney can rationally discuss the police reports, the witness statements and other discovery matters with the indigent client; where the client acknowledges he/she is the one involved; and it is his/her desire to negotiate the best deal possible in the shortest possible period of time.
- 5) I suggest a substitute standard be adopted which requires defense counsel to obtain the discovery (police reports, affidavit of arrest, witness statements attached to police reports, a copy of the defendant's SCOPE report), the charging document and review the same with the client before any plea be negotiated. Investigation should be reserved for those cases in which the defendant denies culpability and those where the defendant wishes to proceed to trial.

Dated this 14th day of March, 2008

Sally Loehrer