



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. Pamela Gates

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Civil

Appointed: 2009

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 122 Returned: 47 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 17 Returned: 14 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 25 Returned: 6 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	96%	100%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	97%	100%	100%
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. Pamela Gates

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	13	76%	3	18%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.65	17	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	71%	4	24%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	17	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	75%	3	19%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
Category Total	48	76%	12	19%	1	2%	2	3%	0	0%	3.68	63	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	83%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
Category Total	94	82%	20	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	114	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	14	78%	3	17%	0	0%	1	6%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	9	64%	4	29%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	3.50	14	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
Category Total	36	72%	11	22%	1	2%	2	4%	0	0%	3.62	50	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	13	76%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0
18. Dignified	13	72%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
19. Courteous	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	13	72%	4	22%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	18	0
21. Patient	13	76%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0
Category Total	66	75%	21	24%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	88	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	67%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	3.47	15	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	10	67%	5	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	10	71%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	3.50	14	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	75%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
Category Total	52	71%	17	23%	2	3%	0	0%	2	3%	3.60	73	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
Category Total	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	



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. Pamela Gates

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	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	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	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	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
Category Total	40	95%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	42	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	4	67%	0	0%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	6	0
Category Total	10	83%	0	0%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	12	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
13. Dignified	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
14. Courteous	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
16. Patient	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
Category Total	24	80%	4	13%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	30	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
Category Total	15	83%	2	11%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	



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. Pamela Gates

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
Category Total	102	85%	18	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	120	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	10	71%	4	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
Category Total	32	76%	10	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	42	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
14. Dignified	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
15. Courteous	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
17. Patient	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
Category Total	60	86%	10	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	70	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
Category Total	34	81%	8	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	42	