

2008 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 2008 ballot.

- ◆ Information on the Arizona Supreme Court justices and Court of Appeals judges begins on Page 2.
- ◆ Information on the Pima County Superior Court judges begins on Page 5.
- ◆ Information on the Maricopa County Superior Court judges begins on Page 13.
- ◆ A JUDGE CHECKLIST is provided on the back inside cover of the pamphlet, Page 28.
- ◆ 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 221
Phoenix, Arizona 85007-3231

E-mail: jpr@courts.az.gov

Internet: www.azjudges.info

Telephone: (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:
Scott Bales

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION ONE:
Diane M. Johnsen
Patricia A. Orozco
Ann A. Scott Timmer
Sheldon H. Weisberg

COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION TWO:
Garye L. Vasquez

JUSTICE/JUDGE REVIEWS

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

BALES, SCOTT

Appointed to the Arizona Supreme Court: 2005

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”	
	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 256 Surveys Returned: 75</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned: 5</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	100%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	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.

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

JOHNSEN, DIANE M.

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2006

29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 347 Surveys Returned: 63</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 78 Surveys Returned: 29</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	96%	91%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

SCOTT TIMMER, ANN A.

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2000

29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 1,489 Surveys Returned: 309</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 387 Surveys Returned: 103</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	86%	100%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	98%
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A

**APACHE/COCONINO/LA PAZ/MOHAVE/NAVAJO/YAVAPAI/YUMA COUNTY VOTERS VOTE ON
THE FOLLOWING COURT OF APPEALS DIVISION I JUDGES**

OROZCO, PATRICIA A.

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 2004

29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”		
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 753 Surveys Returned: 123</i>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 162 Surveys Returned: 40</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	97%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	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.

WEISBERG, SHELDON H.

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division I: 1992

	29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”	
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 942 Surveys Returned: 190</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 267 Surveys Returned: 53</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	100%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	97%
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**
VASQUEZ, GARYE L.

Appointed to Court of Appeals Division II: 2006

	29 Commissioners Voted “Meets” 0 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”	
<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u>	<u>Superior Court Judge Responses</u>
	<i>Surveys Distributed: 187 Surveys Returned: 40</i>	<i>Surveys Distributed: 44 Surveys Returned: 31</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	88%	95%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	96%
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

**RESULTS OF THE COMMISSION’S VOTE ON THE
PIMA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES**

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

NONE

THE FOLLOWING JUDGES *MEET* JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE STANDARDS:

Acuña, Edgar B.
Aragón, Jr., Gustavo
Bernini, Deborah
Cornelio, Carmine
Eikleberry, Jane L.
Escher, Patricia
Fields, Richard S.
Hantman, Howard
Kearney, Jan E.
Kelly, Virginia C.

Lee, Kenneth
Leonardo, John S.
Miller, Leslie B.
Miller, Michael O.
Munger, Clark W.
Sabalos, Charles S.
Simmons, Sarah R.
Tang, Paul E.
Villarreal, Stephen C.
Warner, Nanette

PIMA COUNTY JUDGE REVIEWS

ACUÑA, EDGAR B.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

**23 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
6 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 170 Surveys Returned: 54</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 93 Surveys Returned: 20</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 40 Surveys Returned: 39</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	98%	100%
Communication Skills	89%	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	62%	82%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	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.

ARAGÓN, JR. GUSTAVO

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2006

**26 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 3 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 75 Surveys Returned: 29</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 40 Surveys Returned: 29</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	71%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	100%	93%
Communication Skills	84%	100%	96%
Judicial Temperament	93%	100%	96%
Administrative Performance	86%	94%	96%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

BERNINI, DEBORAH

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 73</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 155 Surveys Returned: 52</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 29 Surveys Returned: 26</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	93%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

CORNELIO, CARMINE

Assignment During Survey Period: Family; Presiding Arbitration
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2002

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 1 Commissioner Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 181 Surveys Returned: 81</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 176 Surveys Returned: 61</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	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	96%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	93%	96%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	89%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	96%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	95%	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.

EIKLEBERRY, JANE L.

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 112</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 28</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 290</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 62</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0</i> <i>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	99%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	98%	99%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

ESCHER, PATRICIA

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Juvenile
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

29 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</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 84</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 22</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 137</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 25</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0</i> <i>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	94%	98%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	88%	93%	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	90%	91%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	87%	94%	99%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	83%	N/A	N/A	N/A

FIELDS, RICHARD S.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal; Assoc. Presiding
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 56</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 35</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 173</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 166</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 60</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 62</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 54</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	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	99%	100%	95%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	98%	99%	95%
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	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.

HANTMAN, HOWARD

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1994

**26 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 3 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 166 Surveys Returned: 42</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 140 Surveys Returned: 38</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 132 Surveys Returned: 79</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	86%	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	68%	97%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	99%	100%
Settlement Activities	83%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

KEARNEY, JAN E.

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Judge
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 100 Surveys Returned: 54</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 19 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 Surveys Returned: 3</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	98%	100%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	96%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	97%	N/A	N/A	N/A

KELLY, VIRGINIA C.

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2002

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 108 Surveys Returned: 30</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 254 Surveys Returned: 75</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	97%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	93%	96%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	97%	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.

LEE, KENNETH

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 1 Commissioner Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 119 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 249 Surveys Returned: 30</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	99%	85%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	88%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	95%	84%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	86%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

LEONARDO, JOHN S.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1993

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 1 Commissioner Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 166 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 121 Surveys Returned: 46</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 116 Surveys Returned: 100</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	95%	100%
Judicial Temperament	80%	96%	100%
Administrative Performance	97%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	72%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MILLER, LESLIE B.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1985

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 132 Surveys Returned: 48</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 24 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 9 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	97%	100%	82%
Communication Skills	91%	92%	85%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	84%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	86%
Settlement Activities	79%	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.

MILLER, MICHAEL O.

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

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 212 Surveys Returned: 73</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 11</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 26 Surveys Returned: 17</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%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MUNGER, CLARK W.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil; Presiding Probate
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1997

**27 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 2 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 3 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 165 Surveys Returned: 56</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 2</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	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	95%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	85%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	77%	50%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	96%	83%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	83%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

SABALOS, CHARLES S.

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1993

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 103 Surveys Returned: 28</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 402 Surveys Returned: 95</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	98%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	96%	97%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	94%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	97%	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.

SIMMONS, SARAH R.

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Family
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2006

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

Note: Judge Simmons is a member of the JPR Commission who could not vote on her own performance finding.

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Presiding Judge Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	Attorney Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 64 Surveys Returned: 28</i>	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 221 Surveys Returned: 29</i>	Juror Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 0 Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	N/A	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	99%	96%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	95%	92%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	98%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	98%	94%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	89%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	96%	N/A	N/A	N/A

TANG, PAUL E.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 2001

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

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 202 Surveys Returned: 64</i>	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	Juror Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 22 Surveys Returned: 8</i>
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	92%	89%	100%
Judicial Temperament	95%	96%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

VILLARREAL, STEPHEN C.

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

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
 1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories	Attorney Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 188 Surveys Returned: 47</i>	Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 108 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	Juror Responses <i>Surveys Distributed: 78 Surveys Returned: 63</i>
	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)	Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	89%	98%	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.

WARNER, NANETTE

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Pima County Superior Court: 1986

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 195 Surveys Returned: 51</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 314 Surveys Returned: 74</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 31 Surveys Returned: 16</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	97%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	96%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	97%	100%
Administrative Performance	89%	96%	100%
Settlement Activities	92%	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:

McClennen, Crane

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

Abrams, Helene F.	Garcia, Jeanne M.	Miles, Linda H.
Akers, Linda A.	Gentry-Lewis, Jo Lynn	Miles, Robert E.
Araneta, Louis A.	Gordon, Michael D.	Oberbillig, Robert H.
Arellano, Silvia R.	Hannah, Jr. John R.	Padilla, Jose S.
Baca, Anna M.	Harrison, Cari A.	Potts, Karen A.
Ballinger, Jr., Eddward P.	Hilliard, Ruth H.	Ryan, Timothy J.
Blakey II, A. Craig	Hoffman, Kristin	Sanders, Teresa A.
Buttrick, John A.	Katz, Paul A.	Steinle, III, Roland J.
Cohen, Bruce R.	Kemp, Michael W.	Stephens, Sherry K.
Contes, Connie C.	Klein, Andrew G.	Trujillo, Richard J.
Davis, Glenn M.	Mahoney, Margaret R.	Udall, David K.
Ditsworth, John R.	McMurdie, Paul J.	Whitten, Christopher T.
Dunevant III, Thomas	McNally, Colleen A.	
Flores, Lisa Daniel	McVey, Michael R.	

MARICOPA COUNTY JUDGE REVIEWS

ABRAMS, HELENE F.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 175 Surveys Returned: 47</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 97 Surveys Returned: 9</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 105 Surveys Returned: 36</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	98%	97%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	92%
Judicial Temperament	100%	80%	96%
Administrative Performance	97%	93%	93%
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.

AKERS, LINDA A.

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

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
 3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 246 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 63 Surveys Returned: 7</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 3</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	92%	88%	100%
Communication Skills	95%	83%	100%
Judicial Temperament	73%	81%	100%
Administrative Performance	94%	95%	100%
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

ARANETA, LOUIS A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1993

28 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
 1 Commissioner Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 92 Surveys Returned: 24</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 330 Surveys Returned: 43</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	93%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	98%	85%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	89%	89%	N/A
Administrative Performance	82%	93%	N/A
Settlement Activities	91%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

ARELLANO, SILVIA R.

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

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 200 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 8</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 71 Surveys Returned: 22</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	97%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	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.

BACA, ANNA M.

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1994

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 19</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 23 Surveys Returned: 3</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 13 Surveys Returned: 10</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	95%	100%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	96%	100%	89%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	94%	100%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	100%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	91%	N/A	N/A	N/A

BALLINGER, JR., EDDWARD P.

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

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 12 Surveys Returned: 4</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 135 Surveys Returned: 33</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 160 Surveys Returned: 24</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	100%	97%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	97%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	99%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	100%	N/A	N/A	N/A

BLAKEY, II, A. CRAIG

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

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 353 Surveys Returned: 70</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 32 Surveys Returned: 5</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	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	83%	100%
Communication Skills	97%	86%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	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.

BUTTRICK, JOHN A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 266 Surveys Returned: 64</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 44 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 13</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	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	93%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

COHEN, BRUCE R.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 123 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 316 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	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	98%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	98%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	98%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	97%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

CONTES, CONNIE C.

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

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 1 Commissioner Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 167 Surveys Returned: 40</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 6 Surveys Returned: 2</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 105 Surveys Returned: 29</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	84%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	0%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	25%	95%
Judicial Temperament	97%	11%	100%
Administrative Performance	70%	50%	94%
Settlement Activities	87%	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, GLENN M.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 244 Surveys Returned: 68</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 89 Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 34 Surveys Returned: 27</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	93%	100%
Communication Skills	92%	91%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	95%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	94%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

DITSWORTH, JOHN R.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 104 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 52 Surveys Returned: 16</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42 Surveys Returned: 17</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	88%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	86%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	91%	97%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	0%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

DUNEVANT, III, THOMAS

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil; Presiding Tax
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1989

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 27 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 249 Surveys Returned: 73</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 66 Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 8 Surveys Returned: 5</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	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	N/A	83%	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.

FLORES, LISA DANIEL

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

29 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: 191</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 48</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 362</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	87%	N/A
Communication Skills	91%	89%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	90%	79%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	87%	N/A
Settlement Activities	88%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

GARCIA, JEANNE M.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

29 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: 171</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 42</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 10</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 45</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 23</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	70%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	95%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	87%	98%
Judicial Temperament	94%	92%	99%
Administrative Performance	82%	97%	95%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

GENTRY-LEWIS, JO LYNN

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

23 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
6 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 150</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 246</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 0</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 0</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	78%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	97%	99%	N/A
Communication Skills	81%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	89%	94%	N/A
Administrative Performance	82%	94%	N/A
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.

GORDON, MICHAEL D.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 218 Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 55 Surveys Returned: 1</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 62 Surveys Returned: 25</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	99%
Administrative Performance	83%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HANNAH, JR., JOHN R.

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

**28 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 1 Commissioner Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 144 Surveys Returned: 43</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 114 Surveys Returned: 10</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	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	97%	N/A
Communication Skills	92%	95%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	86%	90%	N/A
Administrative Performance	78%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	80%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HARRISON, CARI A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 209 Surveys Returned: 34</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 29 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 55 Surveys Returned: 44</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	93%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	95%	92%	97%
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.

HILLIARD, RUTH H.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1986

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 173 Surveys Returned: 53</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 304 Surveys Returned: 19</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	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	83%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	71%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	91%	71%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	91%	N/A
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

HOFFMAN, KRISTIN

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 541 Surveys Returned: 161</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 70 Surveys Returned: 16</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 59 Surveys Returned: 34</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	92%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	94%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	98%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	95%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

KATZ, PAUL A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1989

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 248 Surveys Returned: 72</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 62 Surveys Returned: 5</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 26 Surveys Returned: 20</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	97%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	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.

KEMP, MICHAEL W.

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 137 Surveys Returned: 38</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 88 Surveys Returned: 15</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	99%	96%	N/A
Communication Skills	99%	92%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	97%	97%	N/A
Administrative Performance	99%	98%	N/A
Settlement Activities	83%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

KLEIN, ANDREW G.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 88 Surveys Returned: 19</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 93 Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 44 Surveys Returned: 22</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%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	100%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	100%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MAHONEY, MARGARET R.

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

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 283 Surveys Returned: 60</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 90 Surveys Returned: 3</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 98 Surveys Returned: 36</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	98%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	99%	100%	98%
Judicial Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	98%
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.

MCCLENNEN, CRANE

Assignment During Survey Period: Juvenile
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1997

**10 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 17 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”
 2 Commissioners Voted “Not Voting”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 135 Surveys Returned: 44</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 162 Surveys Returned: 12</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	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	84%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	78%	80%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	60%	88%	N/A
Administrative Performance	70%	86%	N/A
Settlement Activities	80%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MCMURDIE, PAUL J.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 287 Surveys Returned: 45</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 97 Surveys Returned: 85</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 97 Surveys Returned: 94</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	99%	100%
Communication Skills	96%	96%	99%
Judicial Temperament	95%	99%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	98%	99%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MCNALLY, COLLEEN A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Presiding Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 37 Surveys Returned: 21</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 43 Surveys Returned: 12</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 189 Surveys Returned: 15</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	91%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	94%	93%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	92%	88%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	100%	92%	89%	N/A
Administrative Performance	100%	91%	85%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	100%	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.

MCVEY, MICHAEL R.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 1993

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 199 Surveys Returned: 77</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 464 Surveys Returned: 32</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	98%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	90%	N/A
Communication Skills	95%	86%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	92%	91%	N/A
Administrative Performance	96%	92%	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MILES, LINDA H.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 169 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 222 Surveys Returned: 28</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	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	91%	N/A
Communication Skills	92%	92%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	88%	87%	N/A
Administrative Performance	94%	93%	N/A
Settlement Activities	94%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

MILES, ROBERT E.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 405 Surveys Returned: 109</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 14</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 36 Surveys Returned: 34</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%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	95%	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.

OBERBILLIG, ROBERT H.

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

25 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
 4 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 100 Surveys Returned: 31</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35 Surveys Returned: 11</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	98%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	94%	90%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	85%	89%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	96%	N/A
Settlement Activities	79%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

PADILLA, JOSE S.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

26 Commissioners Voted "Meets"
 3 Commissioners Voted "Does Not Meet"

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 132 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 408 Surveys Returned: 27</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	88%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	95%	74%	N/A
Communication Skills	85%	60%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	90%	64%	N/A
Administrative Performance	91%	75%	N/A
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

POTTS, KAREN A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 144 Surveys Returned: 51</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 357 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	99%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	91%	N/A
Communication Skills	100%	81%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	96%	86%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	92%	N/A
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.

RYAN, TIMOTHY J.

Assignment During Survey Period: Assoc. Presiding Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2005

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Presiding Judge Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 57 Surveys Returned: 16</i>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 296 Surveys Returned: 74</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 65 Surveys Returned: 6</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	95%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	94%	97%	100%	N/A
Communication Skills	90%	92%	100%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	93%	95%	100%	N/A
Administrative Performance	98%	95%	100%	N/A
Settlement Activities	N/A	98%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	94%	N/A	N/A	N/A

SANDERS, TERESA A.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 174 Surveys Returned: 28</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 45 Surveys Returned: 9</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 82 Surveys Returned: 57</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	100%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	100%	100%	99%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	97%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

STEINLE, III, ROLAND J.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

**25 Commissioners Voted “Meets”
 4 Commissioners Voted “Does Not Meet”**

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 292 Surveys Returned: 64</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 21 Surveys Returned: 17</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 124 Surveys Returned: 89</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	90%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	93%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	83%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	71%	100%	98%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	99%
Settlement Activities	94%	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.

STEPHENS, SHERRY K.

Assignment During Survey Period: Family
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 153 Surveys Returned: 50</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 111 Surveys Returned: 23</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	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	95%	N/A
Communication Skills	89%	86%	N/A
Judicial Temperament	94%	83%	N/A
Administrative Performance	95%	89%	N/A
Settlement Activities	90%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

TRUJILLO, RICHARD J.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 258 Surveys Returned: 77</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 85 Surveys Returned: 14</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 60 Surveys Returned: 40</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	83%	100%
Communication Skills	91%	83%	100%
Judicial Temperament	96%	81%	100%
Administrative Performance	92%	76%	98%
Settlement Activities	100%	N/A	N/A
Administrative Skills	N/A	N/A	N/A

UDALL, DAVID K.

Assignment During Survey Period: Criminal
 Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2001

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 251 Surveys Returned: 54</i>	<u>Litigant, Witness, ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 107 Surveys Returned: 23</i>	<u>Juror Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 77 Surveys Returned: 45</i>
	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	94%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	98%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	99%	95%	100%
Administrative Performance	99%	96%	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.

WHITTEN, CHRISTOPHER T.

Assignment During Survey Period: Civil

Appointed to Maricopa County Superior Court: 2006

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

<u>Judicial Performance Standards</u> <u>Evaluation Categories</u>	<u>Attorney</u> <u>Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 221</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 74</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Litigant, Witness,</u> <u>ProPer Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 35</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 4</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>	<u>Juror</u> <u>Responses</u> <i>Surveys Distributed: 33</i> <i>Surveys Returned: 27</i> <u>Score (See Footnote)</u>
Legal Ability	89%	N/A	N/A
Integrity	96%	100%	100%
Communication Skills	88%	100%	100%
Judicial Temperament	93%	100%	100%
Administrative Performance	96%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	89%	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.

JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW JUDGE CHECKLIST

This page is provided to assist you when voting on the judges and justices standing for retention. Remove the sheet from your pamphlet, mark your vote on the checklist, and take the checklist with you when voting.

<u>Arizona Supreme Court</u> (All Voters)	<u>Maricopa County Superior Court</u> (Maricopa County Voters)
Bales, Scott Yes___ No___	Abrams, Helene F. Yes___ No___
<u>Court of Appeals Division I</u> (Maricopa County Voters)	Akers, Linda A. Yes___ No___
Johnsen, Diane M. Yes___ No___	Araneta, Louis A. Yes___ No___
Scott Timmer, Ann A. Yes___ No___	Arellano, Silvia R. Yes___ No___
<u>Court of Appeals, Division I</u> (Apache/Coconino/La Paz/Mohave/Navajo/ Yavapai/Yuma County Voters)	Baca, Anna M. Yes___ No___
Orozco, Patricia A. Yes___ No___	Ballinger, Jr., Eddward P. Yes___ No___
Weisberg, Sheldon H. Yes___ No___	Blakey, II, A. Craig Yes___ No___
<u>Court of Appeals, Division II</u> (Cochise/Gila/Graham/Greenlee/Pinal/ Santa Cruz County Voters)	Buttrick, John A. Yes___ No___
Vasquez, Garye L. Yes___ No___	Cohen, Bruce A. Yes___ No___
<u>Pima County Superior Court</u> (Pima County Voters)	Contes, Connie C. Yes___ No___
Acuña, Edgar B. Yes___ No___	Davis, Glenn M. Yes___ No___
Aragón, Jr., Gustavo Yes___ No___	Ditsworth, John R. Yes___ No___
Bernini, Deborah Yes___ No___	Dunivant, III, Thomas Yes___ No___
Cornelio, Carmine Yes___ No___	Flores, Lisa Daniel Yes___ No___
Eikleberry, Jane, L. Yes___ No___	Garcia, Jeanne M. Yes___ No___
Escher, Patricia Yes___ No___	Gentry-Lewis, Jo Lynn Yes___ No___
Fields, Richard S. Yes___ No___	Gordon, Michael D. Yes___ No___
Hantman, Howard Yes___ No___	Hannah, Jr., John R. Yes___ No___
Kearney, Jan E. Yes___ No___	Harrison, Cari A. Yes___ No___
Kelly, Virginia C. Yes___ No___	Hilliard, Ruth H. Yes___ No___
Lee, Kenneth Yes___ No___	Hoffman, Kristin Yes___ No___
Leonardo, John S. Yes___ No___	Katz, Paul A. Yes___ No___
Miller, Leslie B. Yes___ No___	Kemp, Michael W. Yes___ No___
Miller, Michael O. Yes___ No___	Klein, Andrew G. Yes___ No___
Munger, Clark W. Yes___ No___	Mahoney, Margaret R. Yes___ No___
Sabalos, Charles S. Yes___ No___	McClennen, Crane Yes___ No___
Simmons, Sarah R. Yes___ No___	McMurdie, Paul J. Yes___ No___
Tang, Paul E. Yes___ No___	McNally, Colleen A. Yes___ No___
Villarreal, Stephen C. Yes___ No___	McVey, Michael R. Yes___ No___
Warner, Nanette Yes___ No___	Miles, Linda H. Yes___ No___
	Miles, Robert E. Yes___ No___
	Oberbillig, Robert H. Yes___ No___
	Padilla, Jose S. Yes___ No___
	Potts, Karen A. Yes___ No___
	Ryan, Timothy J. Yes___ No___
	Sanders, Teresa A. Yes___ No___
	Steinle, III, Roland J. Yes___ No___
	Stephens, Sherry K. Yes___ No___
	Trujillo, Richard J. Yes___ No___
	Udall, David K. Yes___ No___
	Whitten, Christopher T. Yes___ No___