



**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. Robert M. Brutinel**  
Arizona Supreme Court  
Appointed: 2011

**100% of the Commission Voted Justice Brutinel 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: 219 Returned: 20 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 6 Returned: 1 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	100%	100%
Integrity	100%	100%
Communication	99%	n/a
Temperament	98%	n/a
Admin Performance	95%	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. Robert M. Brutinel

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	10	50%	9	45%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	20
2. Knowledge of law	10	50%	9	45%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	20
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	11	55%	8	40%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	20
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	9	45%	10	50%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	20
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>80</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	3
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	3
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	60%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	5
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	3
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>38</b>

<b>3. Communication</b>												
14. Attentiveness	30	81%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	37
15. Deameanor in communications with counsel	17	71%	5	21%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.58	24
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13
17. Relevant questions	26	68%	10	26%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.61	38
18. Preparation for oral argument	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>135</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
19. Dignified	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24
21. Courteous	17	71%	5	21%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.58	24
22. Patient	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	18	75%	4	17%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.62	24
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	10	53%	4	21%	4	21%	1	5%	0	0%	3.21	19
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>19</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. Robert M. Brutinel

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	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
2. Knowledge of the law	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</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>4.00</b>	<b>4</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</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>4.00</b>	<b>9</b>	