



## 2006 REVIEW OF JUDGES' PERFORMANCE

The information in this pamphlet is provided to help you decide how you want to vote on the judges listed on the 2006 ballot.

- Information on the Arizona Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges begins on Page 209.
- Information on the Pima County Superior Court judges begins on Page 213.
- Information on the Maricopa County Superior Court judges begins on Page 217.
- A JUDGE CHECKLIST is provided on the back inside cover of the pamphlet, Page 234 & 236.
- After reviewing a judge's information, mark "Yes" or "No" next to the judge's name on the checklist.
- Use the checklist when marking your ballot.
- For more information about the judge review process or the JPR Commission, please contact:

Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review  
1501 West Washington Street  
Suite 227  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231

E-mail: [jpr@courts.az.gov](mailto:jpr@courts.az.gov)

Internet: [www.azjudges.info](http://www.azjudges.info) or [www.azjudgereviews.info](http://www.azjudgereviews.info)

Telephone: (602) 364-0098 or (602) 452-3098

*This publication can be provided in alternative formats upon request.*

**ARIZONA SUPREME COURT, COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE,  
COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO**

**RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE  
APPELLATE COURT JUSTICES AND JUDGES**

**THE FOLLOWING JUDGES *DO NOT MEET* JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

NONE

**THE FOLLOWING JUDGES *MEET* JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS**

ARIZONA SUPREME COURT:

Hurwitz, Andrew D.

McGregor, Ruth V.

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE:

Kessler, Donn G.

Norris, Patricia K.

Portley, Maurice

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO:

Brammer, Jr., J. William

Eckerstrom, Peter J.

Espinosa, Philip G.

Howard, Joseph W.

**JUSTICE/JUDGE REVIEWS**

**ALL ARIZONA VOTERS VOTE ON THE  
FOLLOWING SUPREME COURT JUSTICES**

**HURWITZ, ANDREW D.**

Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 2003

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b>28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"</b>	
	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u></b>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 291 Surveys Returned: 117</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 34 Surveys Returned: 14</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
<b>Legal Ability</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Integrity</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Communication Skills</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Judicial Temperament</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>N/A</b>
<b>Administrative Performance</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Administrative Skills</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**McGREGOR, RUTH V.**

Chief Justice  
Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Chief Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 54</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 30</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 685</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 364</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 124</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 44</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	92%	100%
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	99%	97%
Administrative Skills	99%	N/A	N/A

MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE  
FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES

**KESSLER, DONN G.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 629</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 144</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 167</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 36</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	100%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**NORRIS, PATRICIA K.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 463</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 100</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 123</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 39</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	88%	97%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	93%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**PORTLEY, MAURICE.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 663</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 187</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 174</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 75</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	97%
Integrity	98%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	98%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

PIMA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON THE  
FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION II JUDGES

**BRAMMER, JR., J. WILLIAM**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 1997

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 525</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 406</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 186</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 155</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	89%	99%
Integrity	97%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	96%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**ECKERSTROM, PETER J.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2003

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge</u> <u>Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 157</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 56</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 18</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 6</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	90%	88%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**ESPINOSA, PHILIP G.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 1992

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 454</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 318</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 175</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 116</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	88%	94%
Integrity	96%	99%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	88%	94%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**COCHISE/GILA/GRAHAM/GREENLEE/PINAL/SANTA CRUZ COUNTY VOTERS  
VOTE ON THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION II JUDGE**

**HOWARD, JOSEPH W.**

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 1997

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets" 0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 438</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 356</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 193</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 137</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	87%	99%
Integrity	98%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	97%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT - PIMA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY**

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***DO NOT MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES ***MEET*** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

- Alfred, Michael D.
- Borek, Ted B.
- Browning, Christopher C.
- Campoy, Hector E.
- Chandler, Terry
- Cruikshank, Michael
- Davis, John E.
- Harrington, Charles V.
- Kelly, John F.
- Nichols, Richard D.

**PIMA JUDGE REVIEWS**

**ALFRED, MICHAEL D.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1992

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards</u></b> <b><u>Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 142</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 51</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 32</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 2</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 17</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 5</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	89%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	83%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	83%	100%
Settlement Activities	88%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**BOREK, TED B.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2000

27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

*NOTE: Judge Borek is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on his own performance finding.*

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 185 Surveys Returned: 39</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 118 Surveys Returned: 41</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 117 Surveys Returned: 43</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	99%	99%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BROWNING, CHRISTOPHER C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 193 Surveys Returned: 26</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 70 Surveys Returned: 11</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 16 Surveys Returned: 10</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	89%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	90%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	90%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	97%	100%
Settlement Activities	92%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**CAMPOY, HECTOR E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2000

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 168 Surveys Returned: 41</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 198 Surveys Returned: 53</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 34</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	99%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**Arizona  
Judicial Performance Review**

**General Election  
November 7, 2006**

**JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**CHANDLER, TERRY**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2004

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 98 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 578 Surveys Returned: 119</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**CRUIKSHANK, MICHAEL**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal, Presiding Judge -  
Criminal Department  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1998

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned: 12</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 220 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 142 Surveys Returned: 44</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 87 Surveys Returned: 33</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	93%	98%	99%
Judicial Temperament	100%	95%	98%	100%
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	98%	99%
Settlement Activities	N/A	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	98%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DAVIS, JOHN E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1996

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 240 Surveys Returned: 73</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 52 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 18 Surveys Returned: 6</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	85%	100%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**HARRINGTON, CHARLES V.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil, Presiding Judge –  
Civil Department  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 207 Surveys Returned: 68</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 14</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 6</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**KELLY, JOHN F.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1988

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 181 Surveys Returned: 57</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 14</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 2</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	82%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**NICHOLS, RICHARD D.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1995

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 121 Surveys Returned: 33</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 154 Surveys Returned: 21</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	92%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	95%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT - MARICOPA COUNTY VOTERS ONLY**

**RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION'S VOTE ON THE  
MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES**

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES **DO NOT MEET** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE:

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES **MEET** JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Aceto, Mark F.	Anderson, Arthur T.	Barton, Janet E.	Budoff, Robert
Burke, Edward O.	Chavez, Harriett E.	Dairman, Dennis W.	Davis, Norman J.
Donahoe, Gary E.	Downie, Margaret H.	Duncan, Sally S.	Fenzel, Alfred M.
Foster, George H.	Gaines, Pendleton	Gama, J. Richard	Gaylord, John M.
Grant, Larry	Granville, Warren J.	Hauser, Brian R.	Heilman, Joseph B.
Hicks, Bethany G.	Hoag, M. Jean	Holt, Cathy M.	Hotham, Jeffrey A.
Houser, Robert C.	Hyatt, Carey S.	Ishikawa, Brian K.	Jones, Michael D.
Keppel, James H.	Lee, Raymond	Mangum, J. Kenneth	Mroz, Rosa P.
Mundell, Barbara R.	O'Connor, Karen L.	O'Toole, Thomas W	Rayes, Douglas L.
Rea, John C.	Reinstein, Peter C.	Ronan, Emmet J.	Schwartz, Jonathan H.
Swann, Peter B.	Talamante, David M.	Verdin, Maria del Mar	Wilkinson, Michael O.
Willett, Eileen S.			

**MARICOPA JUDGE REVIEWS**

**ACETO, MARK F.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 182 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 45 Surveys Returned: 12</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 17</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**ANDERSON, ARTHUR T.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 152 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 356 Surveys Returned: 35</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	89%	N/A
Communication Skills	95%	88%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	88%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	92%	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BARTON, JANET E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 256 Surveys Returned: 58</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 69 Surveys Returned: 12</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 20</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	96%	100%
Communication Skills	88%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	78%	96%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**BUDOFF, ROBERT**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 124 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 347 Surveys Returned: 48</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	96%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**BURKE, EDWARD O.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 167 Surveys Returned: 36</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 96 Surveys Returned: 8</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 105 Surveys Returned: 40</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	81%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	90%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	85%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	95%	99%
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**CHAVEZ, HARRIETT E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil/Family/Probate  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 118 Surveys Returned: 40</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 350 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	89%	N/A
Communication Skills	95%	90%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	88%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	89%	N/A
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DAIRMAN, DENNIS W.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1992

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 127 Surveys Returned: 19</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 58 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 53 Surveys Returned: 13</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	86%	100%	95%
Judicial Temperament	95%	95%	96%
Administrative Performance	87%	100%	97%
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**DAVIS, NORMAN J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family, Presiding Judge –  
Family Department  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 38 Surveys Returned: 15</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 122 Surveys Returned: 16</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DONAHOE, GARY E.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 140 Surveys Returned: 38</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 88 Surveys Returned: 20</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 83 Surveys Returned: 46</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	98%	100%
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**DOWNIE, MARGARET H.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Associate Presiding Judge  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”  
0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 133 Surveys Returned: 59</i>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 134 Surveys Returned: 35</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 14 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	96%	No Ratings	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	96%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	97%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	99%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**DUNCAN, SALLY S.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 210 Surveys Returned: 64</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 242 Surveys Returned: 21</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	93%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	92%	95%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FENZEL, ALFRED M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 18</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 114 Surveys Returned: 13</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**FOSTER, GEORGE H.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 109 Surveys Returned: 28</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 272 Surveys Returned: 45</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	89%	96%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	93%	93%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**GAINES, PENDLETON**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

***NOTE: Judge Gaines is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on his own performance finding.***

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 342 Surveys Returned: 120</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 112 Surveys Returned: 23</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 20</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	96%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**GAMA, J. RICHARD**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 263 Surveys Returned: 48</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 64 Surveys Returned: 44</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	83%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	98%
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**GAYLORD, JOHN M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 91 Surveys Returned: 23</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 681 Surveys Returned: 103</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	95%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	91%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	92%	90%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**GRANT, LARRY**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 129 Surveys Returned: 40</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 337 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	93%	N/A
Communication Skills	85%	91%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	90%	N/A
Administrative Performance	90%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	92%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**GRANVILLE, WARREN J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 138 Surveys Returned: 36</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 44 Surveys Returned: 6</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 44 Surveys Returned: 23</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HAUSER, BRIAN R.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 179 Surveys Returned: 32</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 93 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 75 Surveys Returned: 22</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	97%
Settlement Activities	97%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**HEILMAN, JOSEPH B.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil/Family/Probate  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 71 Surveys Returned: 27</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 292 Surveys Returned: 20</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	90%	N/A
Communication Skills	96%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	92%	85%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HICKS, BETHANY G.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 236 Surveys Returned: 41</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 83 Surveys Returned: 2</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 92 Surveys Returned: 53</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	62%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	73%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	82%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	87%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	77%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HOAG, M. JEAN**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1996

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 94 Surveys Returned: 23</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 136 Surveys Returned: 29</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**HOLT, CATHY M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 215 Surveys Returned: 33</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 41 Surveys Returned: 2</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 80 Surveys Returned: 31</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	100%	95%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HOTHAM, JEFFREY A.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1987

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 173 Surveys Returned: 42</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 306 Surveys Returned: 31</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	92%	92%	N/A
Communication Skills	97%	93%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	90%	90%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**HOUSER, ROBERT C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2002

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 325 Surveys Returned: 78</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 95 Surveys Returned: 24</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 10</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	96%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	92%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	91%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	97%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**HYATT, CAREY S.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 20 Surveys Returned: 5</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 426 Surveys Returned: 49</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	90%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	92%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	80%	88%	N/A
Administrative Performance	83%	90%	N/A
Settlement Activities	75%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**ISHIKAWA, BRIAN K.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 260 Surveys Returned: 61</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 24 Surveys Returned: 5</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 15</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	91%	100%
Settlement Activities	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**JONES, MICHAEL D.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1995

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 150 Surveys Returned: 37</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 58 Surveys Returned: 12</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 19 Surveys Returned: 11</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	96%	98%
Communication Skills	95%	92%	91%
Judicial Temperament	100%	91%	98%
Administrative Performance	96%	88%	94%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**Arizona  
Judicial Performance Review**

**General Election  
November 7, 2006**

**JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW**

**KEPPEL, JAMES H.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal, Presiding Judge –  
Criminal Department  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1996

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</b>	<b><u>Presiding Judge Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 50 Surveys Returned: 22</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 206 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 6 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 148 Surveys Returned: 21</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	100%	100%	99%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**LEE, RAYMOND**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 173 Surveys Returned: 61</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 451 Surveys Returned: 76</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	97%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**MANGUM, J. KENNETH**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1990

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 98 Surveys Returned: 26</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 230 Surveys Returned: 29</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**MROZ, ROSA P.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 143 Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 351 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	96%	N/A
Communication Skills	97%	93%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	95%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	97%	N/A
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**MUNDELL, BARBARA RODRIGUEZ**

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Judge  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 237 Surveys Returned: 88</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 34 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	94%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**O'CONNOR, KAREN L.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil, Presiding Judge –  
Probate/Mental Health Department  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 14 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 72 Surveys Returned: 25</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 88 Surveys Returned: 13</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 8</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	86%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	91%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	86%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	94%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	93%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**O'TOOLE, THOMAS W.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1984

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 201 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 68 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 78 Surveys Returned: 35</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	95%	100%	99%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**RAYES, DOUGLAS L.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 204 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 92 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 56 Surveys Returned: 13</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**REA, JOHN C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2004

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 194 Surveys Returned: 57</i>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 501 Surveys Returned: 48</i>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	90%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	89%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	92%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	90%	N/A
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**REINSTEIN, PETER C.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1998

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 246 Surveys Returned: 69</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 58 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 17 Surveys Returned: 7</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	90%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	92%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	94%	100%
Settlement Activities	87%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**RONAN, EMMET J.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile, Presiding Judge –  
Juvenile Department  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2000

**28 Commissioners Voted Yes  
0 Commissioners Voted No**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 20 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 49 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 146 Surveys Returned: 24</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 2</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	87%	100%	100%	90%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	94%	99%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

**SCHWARTZ, JONATHAN H.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1991

**26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
2 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 126 Surveys Returned: 29</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 120 Surveys Returned: 13</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 4</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	86%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	89%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	71%	94%	100%
Administrative Performance	77%	97%	92%
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**SWANN, PETER B.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2003

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 284 Surveys Returned: 84</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 46 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 18 Surveys Returned: 12</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	98%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	96%	100%
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**TALAMANTE, DAVID M.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 206 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 101 Surveys Returned: 14</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 95 Surveys Returned: 33</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	93%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	98%	100%
Administrative Performance	93%	94%	97%
Settlement Activities	99%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**VERDIN, MARIA DEL MAR**

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**27 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

***NOTE: Judge Verdin is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on her own performance finding.***

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 99 Surveys Returned: 19</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 303 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	97%	94%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.

**WILKINSON, MICHAEL O.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1987

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 142 Surveys Returned: 33</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 421 Surveys Returned: 32</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	95%	N/A
Communication Skills	96%	94%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	97%	93%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

**WILLETT, EILEEN S.**

Assignment During Survey Period: Family  
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1999

**28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"  
0 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"**

<b><u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u></b>	<b><u>Attorney Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 139 Surveys Returned: 44</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 249 Surveys Returned: 24</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>	<b><u>Juror Responses</u></b> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i> <b><u>Score (See Footnote)</u></b>
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	93%	96%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	94%	95%	N/A
Administrative Performance	93%	95%	N/A
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

FOOTNOTE: The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "satisfactory", "very good", or "superior" in each of the Commission's evaluation categories. Depending on the assignment, a judge may not have responses in certain categories, indicated by N/A (for example, some judicial assignments do not require jury trials). The JPR Commission votes "Yes" or "No" on whether a judge "MEETS" Judicial Performance Standards, based on the statistical information as well as any other information submitted by the public or the judge. Further information on the judges and justices can be found at each court's website.