



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Philip G Espinosa

Court of Appeals Division II
Appointed: 1992

100% of the Commission Voted Judge Espinosa MEETS Judicial Performance Standards
30 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2012	Attorney Surveys	Superior Court Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 1006 Returned: 215 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 328 Returned: 103 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	90%	91%
Integrity	95%	95%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	93%	n/a
Temperament	94%	n/a
Admin Performance	100%	86%

FOOTNOTE:

Judges are evaluated on their judicial performance midway through their term and prior to their retention election. Beginning in 2022, their survey evaluation scores include midterm scores and retention scores. Newly appointed judges serve a two-year term and are evaluated prior to their retention election on their retention scores. The score is the percentage of all evaluators who rated the judge "superior", "very good", or "satisfactory" 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 or no survey responses were returned). 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.



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Philip G Espinosa

2012 Attorney Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
1. Legal Ability												
143. Legal reasoning ability	6	4%	11	7%	23	14%	25	15%	103	61%	3.24	168
144. Knowledge of law	4	2%	10	6%	26	15%	26	15%	102	61%	3.26	168
145. Decisions based on laws and facts	8	5%	13	8%	21	13%	26	15%	100	60%	3.17	168
146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	5	3%	11	7%	28	17%	29	17%	95	57%	3.18	168
Category Total	23	3%	45	7%	98	15%	106	16%	400	60%	3.21	672
2. Integrity												
147. Basic fairness and impartiality	3	2%	12	8%	22	14%	30	19%	88	57%	3.21	155
148. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	3%	2	3%	21	26%	18	23%	37	46%	3.08	80
149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	2	3%	20	26%	16	21%	40	51%	3.21	78
150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	2	3%	20	27%	16	21%	37	49%	3.17	75
151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	2	3%	2	3%	18	24%	16	21%	38	50%	3.13	76
152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	2	3%	18	25%	16	22%	36	50%	3.19	72
153. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	2	2%	18	22%	16	20%	45	56%	3.28	81
154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	2	3%	18	26%	16	23%	34	49%	3.17	70
155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	2%	4	5%	22	26%	18	21%	39	46%	3.04	85
Category Total	9	1%	30	4%	177	23%	162	21%	394	51%	3.17	772
3. Communication Skills and Deportment at Oral Argument												
156. Attentiveness	0	0%	2	5%	5	12%	20	48%	15	36%	3.14	42
157. Demeanor in communications with counsel	0	0%	2	5%	3	8%	24	60%	11	28%	3.10	40
158. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	100%	4.00	2

159. Relevant questions	0	0%	4	10%	9	21%	15	36%	14	33%	2.93	42
160. Preparation for oral argument	0	0%	3	8%	5	14%	15	41%	14	38%	3.08	37
Category Total	0	0%	11	7%	22	13%	74	45%	56	34%	3.07	163
4. Temperament												
161. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	6	15%	17	43%	17	43%	3.28	40
162. Courteous	0	0%	3	7%	4	10%	17	40%	18	43%	3.19	42
163. Patient	0	0%	3	7%	5	12%	17	40%	17	40%	3.14	42
164. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	1	2%	3	7%	4	10%	15	36%	19	45%	3.14	42
Category Total	1	1%	9	5%	19	11%	66	40%	71	43%	3.19	166
5. Admin Performance												
165. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	48	31%	66	42%	43	27%	2.97	157
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	48	31%	66	42%	43	27%	2.97	157



JPR
ARIZONA JUDICIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW

[Home](#) > [Performance Reports](#) > Judicial Reports

Judicial Reports

Commission number votes may vary based upon abstentions. Voting abstentions are procedural matters within the Commission and should not be viewed in any way as a negative factor with respect to a judge's performance.

WHO JUDGES THE JUDGES?



Arizona Commission on Judicial Performance Review

WE CAN HELP.

Hon. Philip G Espinosa

2012 Superior Court Judge Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	UN		PO		SA		VG		SU		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
1. Legal Ability													
77. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	10	10%	20	20%	15	15%	55	55%	3.15	100	3
78. Knowledge of the law	0	0%	7	7%	24	24%	12	12%	57	57%	3.19	100	3
79. Decisions based on law and facts	0	0%	10	10%	20	20%	14	14%	56	56%	3.16	100	3
80. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	1	1%	9	9%	18	18%	14	14%	58	58%	3.19	100	3
Category Total	1	0%	36	9%	82	20%	55	14%	226	56%	3.17	400	
2. Integrity													
81. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	4	5%	17	23%	9	12%	43	59%	3.25	73	30
82. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	9	14%	36	56%	3.22	64	39
83. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	7	11%	38	59%	3.25	64	39
84. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	9	14%	36	56%	3.22	64	39
85. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	7	11%	38	59%	3.25	64	39
86. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	2	3%	17	27%	9	14%	36	56%	3.23	64	39
87. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	7	11%	38	59%	3.25	64	39
88. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	9	14%	36	56%	3.22	64	39
89. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	3	5%	16	25%	7	11%	38	59%	3.25	64	39
Category Total	0	0%	27	5%	146	25%	73	12%	339	58%	3.24	585	
3. Admin Performance													
90. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	2	4%	6	11%	11	20%	18	32%	19	34%	2.82	56	47
Category Total	2	4%	6	11%	11	20%	18	32%	19	34%	2.82	56	