



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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2018	Attorney Surveys	Superior Court Judge Surveys
	Distributed: 553 Returned: 32 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 272 Returned: 52 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	82%	91%
Integrity	98%	94%
Communication	100%	n/a
Temperament	n/a	n/a
Admin Performance	97%	87%

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

2018 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												
20180143. Legal reasoning ability	1	3%	4	12%	6	18%	7	21%	15	45%	2.94	33
20180144. Knowledge of law	1	3%	4	13%	6	19%	6	19%	15	47%	2.94	32
20180145. Decisions based on laws and facts	1	3%	7	21%	4	12%	5	15%	16	48%	2.85	33
20180146. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	1	3%	4	12%	6	18%	7	21%	15	45%	2.94	33
Category Total	4	3%	19	15%	22	17%	25	19%	61	47%	2.92	131
2. Integrity												
20180147. Basic fairness and impartiality	2	8%	1	4%	6	24%	6	24%	10	40%	2.84	25
20180148. Equal treatment regardless of race	0	0%	0	0%	6	33%	5	28%	7	39%	3.06	18
20180149. Equal treatment regardless of gender	0	0%	0	0%	5	26%	6	32%	8	42%	3.16	19
20180150. Equal treatment regardless of religion	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	6	40%	3.07	15
20180151. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	0	0%	0	0%	5	31%	5	31%	6	38%	3.06	16
20180152. Equal treatment regardless of disability	0	0%	0	0%	5	29%	6	35%	6	35%	3.06	17
20180153. Equal treatment regardless of age	0	0%	0	0%	5	28%	6	33%	7	39%	3.11	18
20180154. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	6	40%	3.07	15

20180155. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	0	0%	0	0%	5	33%	4	27%	6	40%	3.07	15
Category Total	2	1%	1	1%	47	30%	46	29%	62	39%	3.04	158
3. Admin Performance												
20180156. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	0	0%	1	3%	11	37%	8	27%	10	33%	2.90	30
Category Total	0	0%	1	3%	11	37%	8	27%	10	33%	2.90	30
4. Communication												
20180166. Attentiveness	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4
20180168. Relevant questions	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4
20180256. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	100%	4.00	4
Category Total	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	12	100%	4.00	12



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

2018 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													
20180077. Legal reasoning ability	1	2%	4	8%	5	10%	9	18%	32	63%	3.31	51	0
20180078. Knowledge of the law	1	2%	4	8%	5	10%	10	20%	31	61%	3.29	51	0
20180079. Decisions based on law and facts	1	2%	4	8%	4	8%	11	22%	31	61%	3.31	51	0
20180080. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	1	2%	2	4%	6	12%	11	22%	31	61%	3.35	51	0
Category Total	4	2%	14	7%	20	10%	41	20%	125	61%	3.32	204	
2. Integrity													
20180081. Basic fairness and impartiality	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	7	15%	37	79%	3.66	47	0
20180082. Equal treatment regardless of race	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	28	85%	3.70	33	0
20180083. Equal treatment regardless of gender	1	3%	3	9%	0	0%	3	9%	28	80%	3.54	35	0
20180084. Equal treatment regardless of religion	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	28	85%	3.70	33	0
20180085. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	27	84%	3.69	32	0
20180086. Equal treatment regardless of disability	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	28	85%	3.70	33	0
20180087. Equal treatment regardless of age	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	27	84%	3.69	32	0

20180088. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	27	84%	3.69	32	0
20180089. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3	9%	29	85%	3.71	34	0
Category Total	9	3%	11	4%	1	0%	31	10%	259	83%	3.67	311	
3. Admin Performance													
20180090. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	3	10%	1	3%	2	7%	9	30%	15	50%	3.07	30	0
Category Total	3	10%	1	3%	2	7%	9	30%	15	50%	3.07	30	