



**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.

All Arizona Voters

### Hon. John Pelander

Arizona Supreme Court  
Appointed: 2009

**100% of the Commission Voted Justice Pelander 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: 333 Returned: 97 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 12 Returned: 4 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	92%	100%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument	100%	n/a
Temperament	100%	n/a
Admin Performance	100%	100%

#### 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. John Pelander

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.		
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>												
143. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	3	9%	2	6%	11	32%	18	53%	3.29	34
144. Knowledge of law	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%	9	26%	21	62%	3.47	34
145. Decisions based on laws and facts	0	0%	4	12%	1	3%	11	32%	18	53%	3.26	34
146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	3	9%	2	6%	10	30%	18	55%	3.30	33
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
147. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%	7	21%	22	67%	3.52	33
148. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%	5	23%	15	68%	3.59	22
149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%	4	18%	16	73%	3.64	22
150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	5	25%	13	65%	3.55	20
151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	4	21%	13	68%	3.58	19
152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	4	21%	13	68%	3.58	19
153. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	4	20%	14	70%	3.60	20
154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	2	11%	4	22%	12	67%	3.56	18
155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	1	4%	3	13%	5	21%	15	63%	3.42	24
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>197</b>
<b>3. Communication Skills and Department at Oral Argument</b>												
156. Attentiveness	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	12	17%	57	80%	3.77	71
157. Demeanor in communications with counsel	0	0%	0	0%	2	3%	11	17%	50	79%	3.76	63
158. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	6	86%	3.86	7

159. Relevant questions	0	0%	0	0%	5	7%	9	13%	57	80%	3.73	71
160. Preparation for oral argument	0	0%	0	0%	3	5%	10	16%	50	79%	3.75	63
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>275</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
161. Dignified	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	23%	55	77%	3.77	71
162. Courteous	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	23%	55	77%	3.77	71
163. Patient	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	16	23%	53	77%	3.77	69
164. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and the judge's ability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	15	21%	56	79%	3.79	71
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>282</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
165. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	7	23%	5	16%	19	61%	3.39	31
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>31</b>



**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. John Pelander

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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
77. Legal reasoning ability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4	0
78. Knowledge of the law	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4	0
79. Decisions based on law and facts	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4	0
80. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>16</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
81. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
82. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
83. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
84. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
85. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
86. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
87. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
88. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
89. Basic fairness and impartiality	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	4.00	3	1
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>27</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
90. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	3.50	2	2
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3.50</b>	<b>2</b>	