



[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.

### Maricopa County Voters Only

**Hon. Samuel A. Thumma**  
 Court of Appeals Division I  
 Appointed: 2012

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Thumma MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**  
 33 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
 0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Superior Court Judge Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 444 Returned: 70 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 121 Returned: 45 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	96%	97%
Integrity	99%	100%
Communication	97%	n/a
Temperament	98%	n/a
Admin Performance	96%	97%

**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. Samuel A. Thumma

2020 Attorney Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>												
1. Legal reasoning ability	28	62%	13	29%	2	4%	1	2%	1	2%	3.47	45
2. Knowledge of law	27	61%	13	30%	3	7%	0	0%	1	2%	3.48	44
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	26	57%	11	24%	7	15%	1	2%	1	2%	3.30	46
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	26	57%	12	26%	6	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.33	46
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.39</b>	<b>181</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	23	66%	7	20%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	3.46	35
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	69%	6	21%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	29
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	84%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	18	75%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.54	24
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>228</b>

<b>3. Communication</b>												
14. Attentiveness	25	68%	10	27%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	37
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	20	67%	8	27%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.57	30
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6
17. Relevant questions	27	73%	6	16%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	37
18. Preparation for oral argument	21	72%	5	17%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	29
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>139</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
19. Dignified	23	77%	4	13%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	30
21. Courteous	22	73%	5	17%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.60	30
22. Patient	22	73%	5	17%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.60	30
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	23	77%	3	10%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.60	30
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>120</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	53%	11	24%	8	18%	2	4%	0	0%	3.27	45
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>45</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. Samuel A. Thumma

2020 Superior Court Judge Survey Responses

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

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total	No Resp
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	37	82%	3	7%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.67	45	0
2. Knowledge of the law	37	82%	3	7%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.69	45	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	37	82%	3	7%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.69	45	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	37	82%	3	7%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.67	45	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>180</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	27	79%	3	9%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	24	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	24	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	25	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	30	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	24	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	24	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	29	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	25	83%	3	10%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	30	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>222</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.75</b>	<b>269</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	28	72%	4	10%	6	15%	1	3%	0	0%	3.51	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>39</b>	