



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 J. Palmer
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2009

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 88 Returned: 11 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 29 Returned: 15 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 32 Returned: 3 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	100%	100%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	100%	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. David J. Palmer

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	8	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	8	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	7	88%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	8	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	28	90%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	31	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	7	88%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	8	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
Category Total	44	81%	10	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	54	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	6	67%	2	22%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	19	76%	5	20%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
18. Dignified	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
19. Courteous	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
21. Patient	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
Category Total	34	77%	10	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	44	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	5	56%	3	33%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	5	71%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	7	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	3	38%	4	50%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	6	67%	3	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	6	75%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
Category Total	25	61%	14	34%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	41	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
Category Total	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	



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 J. Palmer

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	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
Category Total	27	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	27	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
13. Dignified	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
14. Courteous	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
16. Patient	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
Category Total	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	3	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	3	0
Category Total	9	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	9	



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 J. Palmer

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	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	11	79%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
Category Total	102	79%	27	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	129	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	10	67%	5	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
Category Total	32	71%	13	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	45	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
14. Dignified	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
15. Courteous	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	12	80%	3	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
17. Patient	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
Category Total	64	85%	11	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	75	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	8	53%	6	40%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	15	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
Category Total	32	71%	12	27%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	45	