



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. John R. Hannah Jr.
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2005

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 300 Returned: 52 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 24 Returned: 13 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 114 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	82%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	90%	100%	100%
Communication	82%	100%	95%
Temperament	71%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	90%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	54%	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. John R. Hannah Jr.

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	19	40%	10	21%	8	17%	7	15%	4	8%	2.69	48	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	17	35%	12	25%	10	21%	6	13%	3	6%	2.71	48	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	38%	9	20%	13	29%	4	9%	2	4%	2.78	45	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	18	37%	11	22%	12	24%	6	12%	2	4%	2.76	49	0
Category Total	71	37%	42	22%	43	23%	23	12%	11	6%	2.73	190	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	22	45%	6	12%	6	12%	7	14%	8	16%	2.55	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	23	55%	8	19%	8	19%	0	0%	3	7%	3.14	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	53%	8	19%	8	19%	2	5%	2	5%	3.12	43	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	57%	6	16%	8	22%	0	0%	2	5%	3.19	37	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	52%	8	19%	8	19%	1	2%	3	7%	3.07	42	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	21	55%	6	16%	9	24%	0	0%	2	5%	3.16	38	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	57%	7	17%	7	17%	2	5%	2	5%	3.17	42	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	54%	6	16%	9	24%	0	0%	2	5%	3.14	37	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	23	53%	9	21%	9	21%	0	0%	2	5%	3.19	43	0
Category Total	199	53%	64	17%	72	19%	12	3%	26	7%	3.07	373	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	18	37%	12	24%	9	18%	6	12%	4	8%	2.69	49	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	16	42%	7	18%	10	26%	2	5%	3	8%	2.82	38	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	19	38%	14	28%	7	14%	4	8%	6	12%	2.72	50	0
Category Total	53	39%	33	24%	26	19%	12	9%	13	9%	2.74	137	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	21	43%	8	16%	7	14%	5	10%	8	16%	2.59	49	0
18. Dignified	21	42%	10	20%	6	12%	5	10%	8	16%	2.62	50	0
19. Courteous	20	41%	11	22%	2	4%	9	18%	7	14%	2.57	49	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	19	39%	8	16%	8	16%	5	10%	9	18%	2.47	49	0
21. Patient	18	37%	9	18%	6	12%	9	18%	7	14%	2.45	49	0
Category Total	99	40%	46	19%	29	12%	33	13%	39	16%	2.54	246	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	39%	15	31%	10	20%	3	6%	2	4%	2.94	49	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	19	39%	14	29%	13	27%	1	2%	2	4%	2.96	49	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	16	36%	10	22%	12	27%	3	7%	4	9%	2.69	45	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	19	39%	13	27%	14	29%	1	2%	2	4%	2.94	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	17	35%	11	23%	15	31%	3	6%	2	4%	2.79	48	0
Category Total	90	38%	63	26%	64	27%	11	5%	12	5%	2.87	240	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	8	29%	2	7%	5	18%	4	14%	9	32%	1.86	28	0
Category Total	8	29%	2	7%	5	18%	4	14%	9	32%	1.86	28	



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. John R. Hannah Jr.

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	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	75%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	75%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	83%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	6	75%	1	13%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
Category Total	50	74%	9	13%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	68	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	8	80%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	16	84%	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	3.68	19	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	7	70%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
13. Dignified	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
14. Courteous	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	0
16. Patient	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
Category Total	40	74%	13	24%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	54	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	7	70%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	10	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	21	75%	7	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	28	



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. John R. Hannah Jr.

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	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	12	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
Category Total	107	92%	9	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	116	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	10	77%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
Category Total	33	85%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	39	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
14. Dignified	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
15. Courteous	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
17. Patient	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
Category Total	58	89%	7	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	65	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	9	69%	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	13	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
Category Total	33	85%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	39	