



**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. Paul J. McMurdie**  
Court of Appeals Division I  
Appointed: 2016

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge McMurdie 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: 675 Returned: 85 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 198 Returned: 67 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	91%	99%
Integrity	96%	100%
Communication	97%	n/a
Temperament	96%	n/a
Admin Performance	100%	100%

#### 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. Paul J. McMurdie

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	25	47%	13	25%	10	19%	4	8%	1	2%	3.08	53
2. Knowledge of law	25	47%	14	26%	11	21%	2	4%	1	2%	3.13	53
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	26	51%	13	25%	7	14%	2	4%	3	6%	3.12	51
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	25	48%	14	27%	7	13%	5	10%	1	2%	3.10	52
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>209</b>
<b>2. Integrity</b>												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	50%	13	27%	9	19%	1	2%	1	2%	3.21	48
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	14	58%	7	29%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.38	24
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	53%	11	37%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	3.37	30
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	58%	7	29%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.38	24
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	58%	7	29%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.38	24
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	54%	9	35%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.35	26
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	56%	7	28%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.32	25
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	52%	10	34%	3	10%	0	0%	1	3%	3.31	29
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	63%	7	23%	3	10%	0	0%	1	3%	3.43	30
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>260</b>

<b>3. Communication</b>												
14. Attentiveness	24	71%	6	18%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	34
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	21	66%	6	19%	3	9%	2	6%	0	0%	3.44	32
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	2
17. Relevant questions	23	68%	6	18%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	3.50	34
18. Preparation for oral argument	22	71%	5	16%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.55	31
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>133</b>
<b>4. Temperament</b>												
19. Dignified	23	72%	6	19%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.59	32
21. Courteous	21	66%	8	25%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.53	32
22. Patient	20	63%	8	25%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.47	32
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	22	69%	7	22%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	3.53	32
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.53</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	41%	18	35%	12	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.18	51
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>51</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. Paul J. McMurdie

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	57	90%	4	6%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	63	0
2. Knowledge of the law	57	90%	5	8%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	63	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	57	90%	3	5%	2	3%	0	0%	1	2%	3.83	63	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	55	89%	3	5%	3	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.79	62	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>251</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	54	95%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	57	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	42	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	45	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	46	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	41	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	44	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	42	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	45	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	41	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	44	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	41	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	44	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	42	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	45	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	42	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	45	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>388</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>415</b>	
<b>3. Admin Performance</b>													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	42	86%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>49</b>	