



**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.

### Maricopa County Voters Only

**Hon. Christopher T Whitten**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Other  
Appointed: 2006

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 127 Returned: 35 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 18 Returned: 15 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 61 Returned: 10 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	95%
Communication	97%	100%	75%
Temperament	99%	100%	79%
Admin Performance	97%	100%	70%
Settlement Activities	100%	n/a	n/a

#### 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. Christopher T Whitten

2020 Attorney 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	23	68%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%	3.50	34	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	23	68%	8	24%	2	6%	0	0%	1	3%	3.53	34	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	22	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	26	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	27	79%	6	18%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.74	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>128</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	26	74%	7	20%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	83%	1	4%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	17	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	17	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	17	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>188</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	22	65%	10	29%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.53	34	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	55%	9	29%	4	13%	0	0%	1	3%	3.32	31	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	25	74%	7	21%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.62	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>99</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	26	84%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	31	0
18. Dignified	28	85%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
19. Courteous	28	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	34	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	29	85%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.76	34	0
21. Patient	28	82%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.74	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>166</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	22	67%	11	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	33	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	23	70%	7	21%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	33	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	22	65%	6	18%	3	9%	3	9%	0	0%	3.38	34	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	74%	7	21%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.65	34	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	22	69%	8	25%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>166</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	17	77%	4	18%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>22</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. Christopher T Whitten

2020 Litigant Witness 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. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	7	78%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	3.11	9	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.77</b>	<b>43</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	7	88%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	5	63%	0	0%	0	0%	1	13%	2	25%	2.62	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3.12</b>	<b>16</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>														
12. Understanding and compassion	7	70%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	2.90	10	0	
13. Dignified	7	78%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%	3.11	9	0	
14. Courteous	7	88%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	7	70%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	2	20%	3.00	10	0	
16. Patient	7	70%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	2.90	10	0	
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>47</b>		
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	70%	0	0%	0	0%	2	20%	1	10%	3.00	10	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	7	70%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	2.90	10	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	70%	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	2	20%	2.90	10	0	
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>30</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. Christopher T Whitten

2020 Juror 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. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>132</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	75%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>42</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
14. Dignified	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
15. Courteous	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
17. Patient	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>87%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.87</b>	<b>75</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	10	67%	5	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>45</b>	