



AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

W A S H I N G T O N , D C

Louisiana's 22nd Judicial District

Public Defenders' Office:

A Preliminary Assessment

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT



Bureau of Justice Assistance

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

A Joint Program of the Bureau of Justice Assistance, U.S. Department of Justice, and
American University's School of Public Affairs



AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

W A S H I N G T O N , D C

SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
JUSTICE PROGRAMS OFFICE

Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project Report No. 7-190

Louisiana's 22nd Judicial District

Public Defenders' Office:

A Preliminary Assessment

Consultant

Ernie Lewis, JD

January 2012

This report was produced under the auspices of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) Criminal Courts Technical Assistance Project at American University, Washington, D.C. This project is supported by Grant No. 2010-DB-BX-K037 awarded to American University by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the U.S. Department of Justice.

CRIMINAL COURTS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT

A PROGRAM OF THE BUREAU OF JUSTICE ASSISTANCE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

4400 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20016-8159 202-885-2875 FAX: 202-885-2885
www.american.edu/justice

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
A. Background of this Consultancy	1
B. Context in which this Technical Assistance has been Provided	2
II. 22nd Judicial District Public Defenders' Office	3
A. History and Demographics	3
B. Current Structure and Organizational Chart	4
C. Strengths of the Office	4
D. Three Deficiencies Identified by the ACLU	5
1. Caseloads	5
2. Number and Utilization of Investigators	9
3. Resource Parity	11
E. Observations of the Consultant About Other Areas of Concern	14
1. Client Relationships	14
2. Motion Practice	14
3. Preliminary Examinations	15
4. Jury Trials	16
5. Conflicts	16
6. Private Practice	16
7. Shelton Concerns	17
8. Capitol Cases	17
9. Capital Conflict Cases	17
10. Life without Parole Cases	18
11. Misdemeanors	18
12. Juvenile Cases	18
13. CINC	18
14. Nonsupport	19
15. Use of experts	19
16. High number of felonies	20
17. High number of probation revocations	20
III. Compliance of the 22nd PDO with ABA Principles and Guidelines for Indigent Defense Service Delivery	20
A. Compliance with ABA's 10 Principles	20
B. Compliance with ABA's 8 Guidelines	22
IV. Office Management Observations	23
A. Office Culture	23
B. Physical Plant	24
C. Leadership	24
D. Office Manager	24
E. Supervision	24

F. Performance Planning and Evaluations	25
G. Training	25
H. Recruiting	25
I. Policies and Procedures	25
J. Policy Work	26
K. Staff Meetings	26
L. Salaries	26
M. Benefits	26
V. Justice System Functions Relevant to the 22nd PDO's Operations	27
A. Prosecutorial Function	27
B. Judicial Function	27
C. Determination of Indigency	27
VI. Preliminary Recommendations	28
1. Hire a strong leader.	28
2. Lower caseloads for felony, misdemeanor, and juvenile attorneys by hiring additional staff attorneys and support staff.	28
3. Establish workload standards with an overload mechanism.	29
4. The new District Defender should work with the LPDB and local government to establish retirement benefits for all full-time staff.	29
5. The Office needs to move from its present quarters into more professional office space.	29
6. The new District Defender must work with the informal leaders of the office to create a client centered culture.	29
7. Attorneys should be present at 72-hour hearings.	29
8. Attorneys should be required to conduct a significant initial client interview shortly after the 72-hour hearing.	30
9. Attorneys should be actively involved in advocating for reduced bond and changes in bond conditions.	30
10. Attorneys should begin to hold preliminary examinations in significant cases.	30
11. The new District Defender and other management need to support the lawyers when they practice zealously.	31
12. The office should be restructured emphasizing active supervision.	31
13. Require staff attorneys to work full-time with no private practice.	31
14. Evaluate the quality of lawyer staff and determine who wants to remain as a full-time lawyer willing to be client centered.	31
15. Attorneys need to spend more time in the office with regular hours.	32
16. Create a local Task Force to address the funding deficit with a goal of achieving relative parity with the DA's Office.	32
17. Explore the possible utilization of the money held in the Judicial Fund to meet the most immediate needs.	32
18. Hire more investigators.	32

19. Change the duties of investigators.	32
20. Determine why the juvenile investigator is not being utilized by staff attorneys.	33
21. Designate someone other than the District Defender to supervise the investigative function in the office.	33
22. Hold regular office meetings.	33
23. Create a system of performance evaluations.	33
24. Create a salary structure that rewards merit and experience.	33
25. Reform and streamline the provision of conflict services.	33
26. Change how conflict capital cases are handled.	34
27. Consider creating a Life without Parole Task Force.	34
28. Engage with the Deputy of the LPDB for all attorneys to be trained, including on the Louisiana Performance Standards.	34
29. Work with the Deputy of the LPDB to identify future leaders and establish a course of education for them to develop into office supervisors and leaders.	34
30. Review the provision of nonsupport services	34
31. Become a community oriented defender office with the inclusion of full-time social workers.	35
32. Improve the reliability of the indigency determination.	35
33. Encourage the use of experts and ensure funding for them.	35
34. Evaluate the reason why there are so many revocations and what can be done to significantly reduce that number.	35
35. Evaluate whether revenue is being collected at an adequate and reasonable rate, particularly in Washington Parish.	35
36. Rotate attorneys more often between divisions of court.	36
37. The 72-hour hearing should be turned into a more meaningful session of court.	36
38. The District Defender should work with the Sheriff to improve the ability of public defenders to see their clients in the jail.	36
39. Prosecutors should do a more effective job of screening their cases.	37
40. Determine if the practice of pleading cases still exists, and if so, end it.	37
41. The Judiciary should encourage the development of an independent office that is the equal to the DA's Office.	37
42. Consideration should be given to staffing drug court.	37
43. Attention needs to be given to collecting data accurately and, more importantly, to utilizing that data in the management of the office.	37
44. The District Defender should utilize law clerks and interns from nearby law schools.	38
45. Upgraded presentation devices should be purchased so that the public defenders are on a level playing field with the DA's office when trying cases before a jury.	38

VII. Areas to Address in the Full Assessment	38
VIII. Conclusion	39
APPENDIX	40
A. Documents Reviewed	41
B. Persons Interviewed	42
C. Organizational Chart of the 22 nd Judicial District Public Defenders' Office	44