



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. David K. Udall
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2001

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 93 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 204 Returned: 63 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	100%
Communication	100%	n/a	95%
Temperament	100%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	97%
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. David K. Udall

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	15	65%	7	30%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	15	65%	7	30%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
Category Total	62	67%	26	28%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	92	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	16	67%	5	21%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	16	70%	4	17%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	23	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	70%	5	22%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	15	68%	4	18%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	15	68%	6	27%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	22	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	68%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	22	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	73%	4	18%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	22	0
Category Total	141	69%	45	22%	18	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	204	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	63%	8	33%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	19	79%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
Category Total	51	71%	16	22%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	72	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	18	75%	5	21%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
18. Dignified	18	78%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
19. Courteous	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	19	79%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0
21. Patient	18	75%	5	21%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
Category Total	93	78%	21	18%	5	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	119	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	79%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	18	75%	5	21%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	18	75%	5	21%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
Category Total	88	74%	25	21%	6	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	119	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	7	58%	5	42%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	12	0
Category Total	7	58%	5	42%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	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. David K. Udall

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	37	59%	22	35%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	63	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	39	66%	18	31%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	59	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	39	67%	17	29%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	58	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	38	67%	17	30%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	57	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	39	68%	16	28%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	57	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	38	68%	16	29%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	56	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	40	69%	16	28%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	58	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	36	68%	15	28%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	53	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	68%	16	29%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	56	0
Category Total	344	67%	153	30%	20	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	517	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	28	47%	22	37%	8	13%	2	3%	0	0%	3.27	60	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	19	45%	13	31%	7	17%	2	5%	1	2%	3.12	42	0
Category Total	47	46%	35	34%	15	15%	4	4%	1	1%	3.21	102	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	34	55%	25	40%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	3.48	62	0	
13. Dignified	39	63%	20	32%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	62	0	
14. Courteous	40	63%	21	33%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	63	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	39	63%	21	34%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	62	0	
16. Patient	39	62%	23	37%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	63	0	
Category Total	191	61%	110	35%	10	3%	1	0%	0	0%	3.57	312		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	32	52%	18	29%	6	10%	5	8%	1	2%	3.21	62	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	40	65%	21	34%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	62	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	39	62%	21	33%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	63	0	
Category Total	111	59%	60	32%	10	5%	5	3%	1	1%	3.47	187		