

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ROBIN SWEET  
Director and  
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK  
Assistant Court Administrator  
Judicial Programs and Services

RICHARD A. STEFANI  
Deputy Director  
Information Technology

**MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA**

**Indigent Defense Commission (IDC)  
VIDEOCONFERENCE**

**Date and Time of Meeting:** Thursday, July 26, 2018 @ 1:30 p.m.

**Place of Meeting:**

Carson City	Las Vegas	Washoe	Ely
Supreme Court Library Room 107 201 S. Carson Street Carson City, Nevada	Nevada Supreme Court Building Conference Room A/B 408 E. Clark Avenue Las Vegas, NV	Second Judicial District Court Room 214 75 Court Street Reno, NV	Seventh Judicial District Court 801 Clark Street Ely, NV
Teleconference Access: Dial-In # 1-408-740-7256 Meeting ID 1110011234			

***All participants attending via teleconference should mute their lines when not speaking; it is highly recommended that teleconference attendees use a landline and handset in order to reduce background noise.***

**AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order
  - a. Call of Roll
  - b. Determination of a Quorum
- II. Public Comment

*Because of time considerations, the period for public comment by each speaker may be limited. Speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments already made by previous speakers.*
- III. Review and Approval of the June 6, 2018 Meeting Summary\*
- IV. Update on the Nevada Right to Counsel Commission
- V. Clark County Arraignment Process - *Mr. Drew Christensen, Ms. Franny Foresman, Ms. Amy Rose*

- VI. Caseload Standards Discussion
- VII. Status Update on ACLU of Nevada - *Ms. Amy Rose*
- VIII. Status Update on Indigent Defense Clark County - *Mr. Drew Christensen, Mr. Phil Kohn, Ms. JoNell Thomas*
- IX. Status Update on Indigent Defense in Washoe County - *Mr. Bob Bell, Mr. Jeremy Bosler, Mr. Marc Picker*
- X. Status Update on the State Public Defender's Office - *Ms. Karin Kreizenbeck*
- XI. Status Update on the Federal Public Defender's office - *Ms. Megan Hoffman*
- XII. Update on Eighth Judicial District Court Homicide Case Pilot Project - *Mr. Chris Lalli*
- XIII. Other Business
- XIV. Adjournment

- Action items are noted by \* and typically include review, approval, denial, and/or postponement of specific items. Certain items may be referred to a subcommittee for additional review and action.
- Agenda items may be taken out of order at the discretion of the Chair in order to accommodate persons appearing before the Commission and/or to aid in the time efficiency of the meeting.
- If members of the public participate in the meeting, they must identify themselves when requested. Public comment is welcomed by the Commission but may be limited to five minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair.
- The Commission is pleased to provide reasonable accommodations for members of the public who are disabled and wish to attend the meeting. If assistance is required, please notify Commission staff by phone or by email no later than two working days prior to the meeting, as follows: Jamie Gradick, (775) 687-9808 - email: [jgradick@nvcourts.nv.gov](mailto:jgradick@nvcourts.nv.gov)
- This meeting is exempt from the Nevada Open Meeting Law (NRS 241.030 (4)(a))
- At the discretion of the Chair, topics related to the administration of justice, judicial personnel, and judicial matters that are of a confidential nature may be closed to the public.
- **Notice of this meeting was posted in the following locations:** Nevada Supreme Court website: [www.nevadajudiciary.us](http://www.nevadajudiciary.us); Carson City: Supreme Court Building, Administrative Office of the Courts, 201 South Carson Street; Las Vegas: 408 East Clark Avenue.

Supreme Court of Nevada  
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE OF THE COURTS

ROBIN SWEET  
Director and  
State Court Administrator



JOHN MCCORMICK  
Assistant Court Administrator  
Judicial Programs and Services

RICHARD A. STEFANI  
Deputy Director  
Information Technology

**Indigent Defense Commission**  
*Summary Prepared by Jamie Gradick*  
June 6, 2018  
1:30 p.m.

<p><b><u>Attendees Present</u></b> Justice Michael A. Cherry, Chair Judge Tom Armstrong Bob Bell Jeremy Bosler Patrick Caddick Alex Cherup Drew Christensen Joni Eastley Franny Forsman Ben Graham Chris Hicks Dana Hlavac Judge Al Kacin Professor Michael Kagan Philip Kohn Karin Kreizenbeck John Lambrose Chris Lalli</p>	<p>Randall Pike Rachelle Resnick Amy Rose John Slaughter Dagny Stapleton Jeff Wells Judge Nathan Tod Young</p> <p><b><u>AOC Staff</u></b> Jamie Gradick John McCormick</p>
---	--

- I. Call to order
  - Call of Roll and Determination of a Quorum
    - Ms. Jamie Gradick called roll; a quorum was present.
- II. Public Comment
  - Justice Michael Cherry determined there was no public comment.
- III. Review and Approval of the April 16, 2018 Meeting Summary
  - Mr. Phil Kohn moved to approve the meeting summary; Mr. Drew Christensen seconded the approval. The summary was approved.
- IV. Update on the Nevada Right to Counsel Commission (NRTCC)

- Justice Cherry provided a brief overview of the work completed by the NRTCC.
  - The next meeting is set for June 28; all IDC members are welcome to attend.
  - Justice Cherry provided comments on Mr. Carroll’s behalf.
    - Mr. Carroll praised the “quality of people” in the rural county governments and the changes being made but asked to “hold off” on officially supporting the use of a “public defender selection tool” until the work in the rural counties is finished and the report to the NRTCC is completed and presented.
    - The lack of indigent defense oversight is the key issue but the question is at what level that oversight should be implemented in order to be appropriate and effective.
- Mr. John Lambrose provided his thoughts on NRTCC and the Sixth Amendment Center’s efforts.
  - SB377, put forth during the 2017 Legislative Session, was a strong bill because of the good work and efforts put in by the stakeholders and, especially, the rural judges. The NRTCC and the Sixth Amendment Center would be wise to model any proposed recommendations or legislation on the bill.
  - Discussion was held regarding the bipartisan nature of this bill and of this issue; both SB377 and the NRTCC were born through bipartisan efforts.
  - Attendees discussed best approaches for success should the NRTCC submit a bill during the upcoming legislative session.
    - A unified front is necessary; the rural judges, counties and all other stakeholders must be included and on board for this effort to be successful.
    - IDC members are encouraged to reach out to their respective colleagues to garner support for the recommendations that come forth from the NRTCC and the Sixth Amendment Center.
  - Mr. Lambrose commented that he hopes the IDC will remain intact regardless of what happens with the NRTCC. Brief discussion was held regarding the successes of the IDC and the role it could possibly play in continued indigent defense improvements and measures.
  - Mr. Lambrose stressed the need for a unified, statewide oversight body to address indigent defense and the need for state funding.
- Attendees briefly discussed indigent defense in immigration issues in the rural counties; Justice Cherry asked Professor Kagan to discuss these issues with Mr. Carroll.

#### V. Update on Caseload Standards

- Mr. Phil Kohn commented that the Commission spent a significant amount of time and effort creating a caseload definition (under ADKT 0411) and asked why this definition is not being used to determine caseloads.
  - Mr. John McCormick commented that he would send a copy of the dictionary to the LCB for distribution to the NRTCC membership
- Mr. John McCormick provided the report on behalf of Hans Jessup.
  - Attendees discussed the gaps in the data; a suggestion was made that proposed caseload standards for the rural counties be created as a starting point for this.
  - Mr. Lambrose suggested the Commission work on developing a “soft recommendation” or benchmark for caseload standards; Judge Young supported this

and commented that standards would help courts support requests for funding before the county commissions.

- Mr. Lambrose suggested the Commission look to data pulled from other states with similarly situated rural counties for support.
  - Ms. Franny Forsman expressed concern with this approach and commented that there is still too much unknown data; it would be better to wait for the Sixth Amendment Center’s report for guidance on this issue.
  - Numbers are easily “misused”; it may be better to develop standards instead of a benchmark for caseloads. Judge Young commented that he does not support waiting.
  - Professor Kagan commented that much more granular data is needed; it would be helpful to not only know the types of attorneys and cases but also the crimes at issue.
- Ms. Forsman suggested standards be built into the contracts. Mr. Jeff Wells commented that counties finalized their budgets in May and expressed concern with “stretching it beyond a budgetary concern” by adding standards to contracts.
  - Attendees discussed how counties would view caseload standards as more judges are added to the bench.
  - Bookings and caseloads are increasing; this needs to be addressed.
- Ms. Amy Rose commented that private caseload numbers of those contract attorneys with private practices should also be considered.

#### VI. Status Update on ACLU of Nevada

- Ms. Amy Rose informed attendees that the ACLU of Nevada is still in the certification stage in the process; they continue to move forward and anticipate that it will be completed by the end of the summer.

#### VII. Status Update on Indigent Defense in Clark County (*Portions of this discussion were inaudible*)

- Mr. Phil Kohn expressed concern regarding adding more judges to the bench in Clark County with the current arraignment process.
- Attendees discussed the “low level arraignment” process currently being used in Clark County.
  - Mr. Kohn expressed concern that this process functions as a “cattle call” and violates everything ADKT 411 accomplishes; the judges should be handling the arraignments rather than sending all arraignments to a master.
  - Mr. Kohn explained that, under this process, the district court judge likely won’t see the defendant until the day of sentencing; Mr. Kohn informed attendees that this practice is wrong and does a disservice to the defendant.
  - Attendees discussed the process for taking felony pleas; a magistrate appointed by the district judge usually does this. Discussion was held regarding whether this is “legal” and where proper jurisdiction for this lies.
    - A comment was made that a district court rule allows for this; however, the process is not accomplishing what it was intended to and the Nevada Supreme Court should evaluate this practice and the rule.

- Justice Cherry asked for clarification regarding how the process devolved to this point and why the Nevada Supreme Court has not heard about this issue before now.
- Attendees discussed problems this process presents for all stakeholders including challenges to negotiations and hindering a client’s ability to speak with his/her attorney privately.
- Attendees discussed possible solutions to address this problem.
  - Mr. Lambrose suggested that the IDC vote on a motion to submit a request to the Chief Judge of the Eighth Judicial District that this process be eliminated.
  - Concern was expressed regarding making a formal motion on this at this point.
  - A suggestion was made that Ms. Forsman, Ms. Rose, and Mr. Drew Christensen work together to observe and evaluate the process and report back to the full-Commission at the next meeting.
  - Ms. Forsman commented that if this issue is brought before the Nevada Supreme Court, it should be brought under ADKT 411 and the performance standards therein.
- Mr. Christensen commented on caseload standards and contract attorneys in Clark County; he is comfortable with the caseload numbers his office tracks for these 42 attorneys.
- Mr. Jeff Wells informed attendees that Clark County has provided the ACLU with budget information for indigent defense in Clark County; about 46 million was spent on indigent defense in the last fiscal year. This is an increase from 38 million in fiscal year 2015.
  - When compared to other similarly situated states, Clark County pays more for indigent defense than 23 other states.

#### VIII. Status Update on Indigent Defense in Washoe County

- Mr. Jeremy Bosler informed attendees that Washoe County is in the process of selecting a new public defender.
- The Washoe County PD office has temporarily declared unavailability on category A cases because it has so many open murder and sexual assault cases; the APD has agreed to handle the overflow.
- There is still a challenge with scheduling and maintaining vertical representation; they are looking into technical assistance grants to fund an analysis and improvement measures.
- There are still issues with the new pretrial release program; local stakeholders will be meeting soon to discuss.
- Attendees discussed immigration practice concerns.
  - Professor Kagan commented that he is open to providing guidance/resources to attorneys; he has been working with Clark County public defenders on consultations and hopes that there can be a statewide “shared knowledge base.”
- Mr. Bob Bell commented that caseload standards for private attorneys should include a breakdown of how many private cases he/she is taking and what types of cases are included.
- Mr. John Slaughter thanked Mr. Bosler for his service as Washoe County Public Defender and congratulated him on his upcoming retirement.

- IX. Status Update from the State Public Defender's Office
- Ms. Karin Kreizenbeck provided a brief update and informed attendees that her office is currently building its budget; her budget is driven by hours, not by caseload.
  - Justice Cherry suggested that Ms. Kreizenbeck meet with John McCormick and Ben Graham to discuss future roles for the State PD Office should legislation move forward in the next session.
    - Mr. Graham clarified for the record that he is currently acting only as a resource, under no contact or obligation to any party.
- X. Status Update on the Federal Public Defender's Office
- No update was provided from the Federal Public Defender's Office.
- XI. Update on the Eighth Judicial District Court Homicide Case Pilot Project
- Mr. Chris Lalli gave an update on the Eighth Judicial District Court Homicide Case Pilot Project.
    - July 1, 2018 will be the next benchmark and the program will be evaluated for success/challenges.
    - There may be a change in the judges currently on the team: Judge Leavitt will cycle in to replace Judge Johnson.
    - Overall, the program is functioning well; attendees expressed satisfaction but there is room for improvement.
      - Monthly status checks take up quite a bit of time.
- XII. Other Business
- Justice Cherry introduced Mr. Alex Cherup; Mr. Cherup provided a brief overview of his background and informed attendees that he will be moving to New Mexico to pursue Indigent defense issues there.
    - Mr. Cherup will remain involved with the IDC as much as possible from his new location and will look into finding a potential NAACP representative to replace him on the IDC.
  - Mr. Ben Graham reminded attendees that proposed legislation (addition of new judges, anything that comes from the NRTCC, etc.) would not be successful if there is a “naysayer in the crowd”.
- XIII. Adjournment
- Justice Cherry adjourned the meeting at 3:00 p.m..

PD Cases		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Alternate PD Cases		2017
Adult	Felonies	167	159	121	135	129		Felonies	53
	Gross Misdemeanors	21	25	25	15	26		Gross Misdemeanors	3
	Misdemeanors	134	156	145	154	116		Misdemeanors	29
	Probation Violations	27	22	28	22	22		Probation Violations	18
	Parole Violations	4	2	4	4	4		Parole Violations	0
	Direct Appeals	13	4	7	8	4		Direct Appeals	0
	Justice Court Appeals	4	2	1	1	2		Justice Court Appeals	0
	Others	0	2	34	28	19		Others	14
	Felonies	13	16	7	10	6		Felonies	16
	Gross Misdemeanors	1	5	1	1	2		Gross Misdemeanors	5
Juvenile	Misdemeanors	34	38	79	40	5		Misdemeanors	34
	Probation Violations	15	19	11	13	9		Probation Violations	21
	Parole Violations	0	0	0	2	0		Parole Violations	0
	Direct Appeals	0	3	0	0	0		Direct Appeals	0
	Other	14	43	58	32	5		Other	108
	432B Cases	N/A	N/A	N/A	7	2		432B Cases	16
	Total Cases	447	496	521	472	351		Total Cases	317
	Jury Trials	2	2	3	2	1		Jury Trials	1
	Trial %	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00		Trial %	0.0



# HUMBOLDT COUNTY CASELOADS: COMPARISON TO NAC STANDARDS

PD Cases		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017		Alternate PD Cases		2017
Adult	Felonies	1.11	1.06	0.81	0.90	0.86		Adult	Felonies	0.35
	Gross Misdemeanors	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.04	0.07			Gross Misdemeanors	0.01
	Misdemeanors	0.34	0.39	0.36	0.39	0.29			Misdemeanors	0.07
	Direct Appeals	0.52	0.16	0.28	0.32	0.16			Direct Appeals	0.00
Juvenile	Felonies	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.05	0.03		Juvenile	Felonies	0.08
	Gross Misdemeanors	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01			Gross Misdemeanors	0.03
	Misdemeanors	0.17	0.19	0.40	0.20	0.03			Misdemeanors	0.17
<b>Total Cases</b>		<b>2.26</b>	<b>1.97</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>1.90</b>	<b>1.44</b>		<b>Total Cases</b>		<b>0.71</b>

## Indigent Defense Data Dictionary

The Indigent Defense Commission approved and directed the collection of indigent defense data on October 2010. The objective for gathering indigent defense data is to identify and define basic data elements for counting of cases assigned to appointed or indigent defense counsel. Phase I is expected to define those basic cases assigned and disposed categories necessary to begin understanding the caseload of appointed counsel. Future phases will expand data elements to be captured by counsel.

### Indigent Defense Case Type Definitions

**Felony Case:** A subcategory of criminal cases in which a defendant is charged with the violation of a state law(s) that involves an offense punishable by death, or imprisonment in the state prison for more than 1 year.

**Gross Misdemeanor Case:** A subcategory of criminal cases in which a defendant is charged with the violation of state laws that involve offenses punishable by imprisonment for up to 1 year and (or) a fine of \$2,000.

**Misdemeanor Non-Traffic Case:** A criminal subcategory in which a defendant is charged with the violation of state laws and/or local ordinances that involve offenses punishable by fine or incarceration or both, the upper limits of which are prescribed by statute (NRS 193.120, generally set as no more than 6 months incarceration and/or \$1,000 fine).

**Misdemeanor Traffic Case:** A criminal subcategory for Justice and Municipal Courts in which a defendant is charged with the violation of traffic laws, local ordinances pertaining to traffic, or federal regulations pertaining to traffic.

**Juvenile Case:** A subcategory of juvenile cases that includes cases involving an act committed by a juvenile, which, if committed by an adult, would result in prosecution in criminal court and over which the juvenile court has been statutorily granted original or concurrent jurisdiction.

### Additional Indigent Defense Caseload Statistics

**Death Penalty:** The number of defendants for which the District Attorney's Office has filed the notice of intent to seek the death penalty, in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 250.

**Probation Revocations:** The number of defendants for which post-adjudication criminal activity involving a motion to revoke probation due to an alleged violation of one or more conditions of probation (usually from the Department of Parole and Probation) or suspended sentence. The unit of count for revocation hearings is a single defendant, regardless of the number of charges involved. Revocation hearings are counted when the initiating document (e.g., violation report) is received by the court.

**Informal Juvenile Hearing (involving a judicial officer):** The number of hearings/events involving a juvenile in which no formal charge has been filed with the court. Only record an informal hearing if it is held on a matter that is not a part of an existing case. The court may impose a disposition as a result of the informal hearing.

**Juvenile Detention Hearing:** The number of hearings requesting a juvenile to be held in detention, or continued to be held in detention, pending further court action(s) within the same jurisdiction or another jurisdiction. Record a detention hearing that is held.

**Conflicts:** The number of defendants during the reporting period that a lawyer's appointment to case ended because of a conflict that necessitated the transfer of the case to another lawyer.

**Specialty Court Cases:** A count of cases in which a lawyer represents a defendant in a specialty court program, i.e., drug court or mental health court. This type of case should be counted in this additional category when the defendant appears during a specialty court session within the reporting period or if the indigent defense counsel is assigned to the defendant for specialty court.

**Justice Court Felony/Gross Misdemeanor Reductions:** A number of defendants for which any felony or gross misdemeanor charge was totally (and only) adjudicated in justice court.

## Caseload Inventory

### Unit of Count

For felony, gross misdemeanor, and misdemeanor criminal cases, the unit of count is a single defendant on a single charging document (i.e., one defendant on one complaint or information from one or more related incidents on one charging document is one case, regardless of the number of counts)<sup>1</sup>. For juvenile cases, the unit of count is a single juvenile defendant on a single petition regardless of the number of counts. For traffic cases, the unit of count is a single case (by defendant) based on an original charging document from a single incident.

For defendants in cases whereby multiple charges are involved, courts will utilize a hierarchy (described below) when classifying the case for statistical purposes. For example, if a defendant is charged on a single charging document with a felony and a gross misdemeanor, for statistical purposes, the case is counted as a felony.

Felony and gross misdemeanor cases in Justice Court are counted when counsel is appointed to the case by the Court.

Misdemeanor and traffic cases in Justice and Municipal Courts are counted when counsel is appointed to the case by the Court.

Additional charges such as failure to appear or habitual criminal are not counted at this time because those are added after the initial charging document.

**Appointment:** Any time a lawyer is asked or assigned to act on behalf of a person in a criminal or juvenile matter by a judicial officer. An appointment ends when a lawyer is no longer involved in a case

<sup>1</sup> This definition varies from the national standard as promulgated by the National Center for State Courts in that it counts a single defendant on a single charging document, while the national standard counts a single defendant with a single incident/transaction. This means that the Nevada measure herein, will under report caseload at times when one defendant is charged with separate crimes from separate incidents that may necessitate indigent defense counsel to treat the appointment as multiple cases. In the event that the capacity to accurately count cases in line with the national model becomes available in Nevada, the intent of the Subcommittee is that this definition be revisited.

for whatever reason. There can be multiple appointments for a single defendant/case during the duration of the case.

### When to Count Filings

**Beginning Pending:** A count of cases by defendant that, at the start of the reporting period, are awaiting disposition.

**New Appointments:** A count of cases by defendant that have been assigned counsel for the first time of each new appointment.

Cases filed in district courts where indigent defense counsel continues to represent the defendant on the case after their appointment in justice court, should be counted as new appointments in district court reports.

**Warrant (Placed on Inactive Status):** A count of cases in which a warrant for failure to appear has been issued, a diversion program has been ordered, or other similar incident that makes the case inactive.

**Returned from Warrant (Re-activated):** A count of cases in which a defendant has been arrested on a failure to appear warrant and has appeared before the court, returned from diversion program, or other similar occurrence that makes the case active.

**Adjudicated/Disposed/Closed Cases:** A count of cases by defendant for which an original entry of adjudication has been entered or for which an appointment has ended.

**Ending Pending:** A count of cases by defendant that, at the end of the reporting period, are awaiting disposition.

**Set for Review:** A count of cases that, following an initial Entry of Judgment during the reporting period, are awaiting regularly scheduled reviews involving a hearing before a judicial officer. For example, if a status check hearing is ordered to review post adjudication compliance.

## Manner of Disposition

### Unit of Count

For felony, gross misdemeanor, and misdemeanor criminal cases, the unit of count is a single defendant on a single charging document (i.e., one defendant on one complaint from one or more related incidents is one case, regardless of the number of counts)<sup>2</sup>. A criminal case is considered disposed when final adjudication for that defendant or case occurs. For statistical purposes, final adjudication is defined as the date of sentencing, date of adjudication, or date charges are otherwise disposed, whichever occurs last. A case may be considered closed for an appointed attorney when the appointment ends regardless of adjudicatory status. Counsel should count the case adjudicated or disposed in the same category as it was counted in (felony in, felony out).

---

<sup>2</sup> This definition varies from the national standard as promulgated by the National Center for State Courts in that it counts a single defendant on a single charging document, while the national standard counts a single defendant with a single incident/transaction. This means that the Nevada measure herein, will under report caseload at times when one defendant is charged with separate crimes from separate incidents that may necessitate indigent defense counsel to treat the appointment as multiple cases. In the event that the capacity to accurately count cases in line with the national model becomes available in Nevada, the intent of the Subcommittee is that this definition be revisited.

## INDIGENT DEFENSE DATA DICTIONARY

### Phase I, Indigent Defense Commission Approved Version, October 14, 2010

**OBJECTIVE:** To identify and define basic data elements for counting of cases assigned to appointed or indigent defense counsel. Phase I is expected to define those basic cases assigned and disposed categories necessary to begin understanding the caseload of appointed counsel. Future phases will expand data elements to be captured by counsel.

#### CASES APPOINTED

**Appointment:** Any time a lawyer is asked or assigned to act on behalf of a person in a criminal or juvenile matter by a judicial officer. An appointment ends when a lawyer is no longer involved in a case for whatever reason. There can be multiple appointments for a single defendant/case during the duration of the case.

**Unit of Count** - For felony, gross misdemeanor, and misdemeanor criminal cases, the unit of count is a single defendant on a single charging document (i.e., one defendant on one complaint or information from one or more related incidents on one charging document is one case, regardless of the number of counts).<sup>1</sup> For juvenile cases, the unit of count is a single juvenile defendant on a single petition regardless of the number of counts. For traffic cases, the unit of count is a single case (by defendant) based on an original charging document from a single incident.

For defendants in cases whereby multiple charges are involved, courts will utilize a hierarchy (described below) when classifying the case for statistical purposes. For example, if a defendant is charged on a single charging document with a felony and a gross misdemeanor, for statistical purposes, the case is counted as a felony.

Felony and gross misdemeanor cases in Justice Court are counted when counsel is appointed to the case by the Court.

Misdemeanor and traffic cases in Justice and Municipal Courts are counted when counsel is appointed to the case by the Court.

Additional charges such as failure to appear or habitual criminal are not counted at this time because those are added after the initial charging document.

**Felony Case:** A subcategory of criminal cases in which a defendant is charged with the violation of a state law(s) that involves an offense punishable by death, or imprisonment in the state prison for more than 1 year.

**Gross Misdemeanor Case:** A subcategory of criminal cases in which a defendant is charged with the violation of state laws that involve offenses punishable by imprisonment for up to 1 year and/or a fine of \$2,000.

---

<sup>1</sup> This definition varies from the national standard as promulgated by the National Center for State Courts in that it counts a single defendant on a single charging document, while the national standard counts a single defendant with a single incident/transaction. This means that the Nevada measure herein, will under report caseload at times when one defendant is charged with separate crimes from separate incidents that may necessitate indigent defense counsel to treat the appointment as multiple cases. In the event that the capacity to accurately count cases in line with the national model becomes available in Nevada, the intent of the Subcommittee is that this definition be revisited.

**Misdemeanor Non-Traffic Case:** A criminal subcategory in which a defendant is charged with the violation of state laws and/or local ordinances that involve offenses punishable by fine or incarceration or both, the upper limits of which are prescribed by statute (NRS 193.120, generally set as no more than 6 months incarceration and/or \$1,000 fine).

**Misdemeanor Traffic Case:** A criminal subcategory for Justice and Municipal Courts in which a defendant is charged with the violation of traffic laws, local ordinances pertaining to traffic, or federal regulations pertaining to traffic.

**Juvenile Case:** A subcategory of juvenile cases that includes cases involving an act committed by a juvenile, which, if committed by an adult, would result in prosecution in criminal court and over which the juvenile court has been statutorily granted original or concurrent jurisdiction.

### **CASES ADJUDICATED/DISPOSED**

**Unit of Count** - For felony, gross misdemeanor, and misdemeanor criminal cases, the unit of count is a single defendant on a single charging document (i.e., one defendant on one complaint from one or more related incidents is one case, regardless of the number of counts).<sup>2</sup>

A criminal case is considered disposed when final adjudication for that defendant or case occurs. For statistical purposes, final adjudication is defined as the date of sentencing, date of adjudication, or date charges are otherwise disposed, whichever occurs last. A case may be considered closed for an appointed attorney when the appointment ends regardless of adjudicatory status.

Counsel should count the case adjudicated or disposed in the same category as it was counted in (felony in, felony out).

### **CASELOAD INVENTORY**

**Unit of Count** - For felony, gross misdemeanor, misdemeanor, and traffic criminal cases, the unit of count is a single defendant on a single case. The ending pending number for one month should be the beginning pending number for the next month.

**Beginning Pending:** A count of cases by defendant that, at the start of the reporting period, are awaiting disposition.

**New Appointments:** A count of cases by defendant that have been assigned counsel for the first time of each new appointment.

**Warrant (Placed on Inactive Status):** A count of cases in which a warrant for failure to appear has been issued, a diversion program has been ordered, or other similar incident that makes the case inactive.

---

<sup>2</sup> This definition varies from the national standard as promulgated by the National Center for State Courts in that it counts a single defendant on a single charging document, while the national standard counts a single defendant with a single incident/transaction. This means that the Nevada measure herein, will under report caseload at times when one defendant is charged with separate crimes from separate incidents that may necessitate indigent defense counsel to treat the appointment as multiple cases. In the event that the capacity to accurately count cases in line with the national model becomes available in Nevada, the intent of the Subcommittee is that this definition be revisited.

**Returned from Warrant (Re-activated):** A count of cases in which a defendant has been arrested on a failure to appear warrant and has appeared before the court, returned from diversion program, or other similar occurrence that makes the case active.

**Adjudicated/Disposed/Closed Cases:** A count of cases by defendant for which an original entry of adjudication has been entered or for which an appointment has ended.

**Ending Pending:** A count of cases by defendant that, at the end of the reporting period, are awaiting disposition.

**Set for Review:** A count of cases that, following an initial Entry of Judgment during the reporting period, are awaiting regularly scheduled reviews involving a hearing before a judicial officer. For example, if a status check hearing is ordered to review post adjudication compliance.

### **ADDITIONAL STATISTICS**

**Death Penalty:** The number of defendants for which the District Attorney's Office has filed the notice of intent to seek the death penalty, in accordance with Supreme Court Rule 250.

**Probation Revocations:** The number of defendants for which post-adjudication criminal activity involving a motion to revoke probation due to an alleged violation of one or more conditions of probation (usually from the Department of Parole and Probation) or suspended sentence. The unit of count for revocation hearings is a single defendant, regardless of the number of charges involved. Revocation hearings are counted when the initiating document (e.g., violation report) is received by the court.

**Informal Juvenile Hearing (involving a judicial officer):** The number of hearings/events involving a juvenile in which no formal charge has been filed with the court. Only record an informal hearing if it is held on a matter that is not a part of an existing case. The court may impose a disposition as a result of the informal hearing.

**Juvenile Detention Hearing:** The number of hearings requesting a juvenile to be held in detention, or continued to be held in detention, pending further court action(s) within the same jurisdiction or another jurisdiction. Only record a detention hearing if it is held.

**Conflicts:** The number of defendants during the reporting period that a lawyer's appointment to case ended because of a conflict that necessitated the transfer of the case to another lawyer.

**Specialty Court Cases:** A count of cases in which a lawyer represents a defendant in a specialty court program, i.e., drug court or mental health court. This type of case should be counted in this additional category when the defendant appears during a specialty court session within the reporting period or if the indigent defense counsel is assigned to the defendant for specialty court.

**Justice Court Felony/Gross Misdemeanor Reductions:** A number of defendants for which any felony or gross misdemeanor charge was totally (and only) adjudicated in justice court.

Reporting Unit: \_\_\_\_\_

Reporting Period: \_\_\_\_\_

MMM / YYYY

**Indigent Defense Caseload Inventory Worksheet**

Felony	Gross Misdemeanor	Misdemeanor	Non-Traffic	Misdemeanor Traffic	Juvenile
--------	-------------------	-------------	-------------	---------------------	----------

1. Beginning Pending					
2. New Appointments					(+)
3. Returned From Warrant (Re-activated)					(+)
4. Adjudicated/Disposed/Closed					(-)
5. Warrant (Placed on Inactive Status)					(-)
6. End Pending					
7. Set for Review					

**Indigent Defense Additional Statistics**

Death Penalty (S.C.R. 250) <b>CASES</b>	Probation Revocations <b>HEARINGS</b>	Informal Juvenile <b>HEARINGS</b> (Involving a Judicial Officer)	Juvenile Detention <b>HEARINGS</b>	Conflicts <b>CASES</b>	Specialty Court <b>CASES</b>	Justice Court Felony/Gross Misdemeanour Reductions <b>CASES</b>

Prepared by: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_