



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. Margaret R. Mahoney
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2002

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 108 Returned: 29 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 56 Returned: 16 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 33 Returned: 7 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	91%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	79%
Communication	96%	100%	80%
Temperament	97%	100%	93%
Admin Performance	92%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	88%	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. Margaret R. Mahoney

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	16	59%	5	19%	3	11%	2	7%	1	4%	3.22	27	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	14	54%	7	27%	3	12%	0	0%	2	8%	3.19	26	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	14	58%	5	21%	3	13%	1	4%	1	4%	3.25	24	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	15	58%	6	23%	3	12%	1	4%	1	4%	3.27	26	0
Category Total	59	57%	23	22%	12	12%	4	4%	5	5%	3.23	103	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	16	57%	9	32%	1	4%	0	0%	2	7%	3.32	28	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	10	63%	6	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	68%	6	27%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	69%	5	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	10	67%	5	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	15	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	73%	4	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	70%	6	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	62%	5	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	74%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	19	0
Category Total	109	66%	51	31%	2	1%	0	0%	2	1%	3.62	164	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	19	66%	7	24%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.52	29	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	56%	6	22%	4	15%	1	4%	1	4%	3.22	27	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	20	69%	7	24%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
Category Total	54	64%	20	24%	8	9%	2	2%	1	1%	3.46	85	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	17	61%	8	29%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
18. Dignified	20	69%	7	24%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
19. Courteous	17	59%	10	34%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.48	29	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	19	66%	8	28%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.48	29	0
21. Patient	16	55%	11	38%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.45	29	0
Category Total	89	62%	44	31%	7	5%	3	2%	1	1%	3.51	144	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	62%	7	24%	2	7%	1	3%	1	3%	3.38	29	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	19	68%	5	18%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	28	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	16	57%	5	18%	3	11%	1	4%	3	11%	3.07	28	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	19	66%	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	1	3%	3.38	29	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	13	46%	6	21%	6	21%	1	4%	2	7%	2.96	28	0
Category Total	85	60%	28	20%	18	13%	4	3%	7	5%	3.27	142	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	50%	1	13%	2	25%	0	0%	1	13%	2.88	8	0
Category Total	4	50%	1	12%	2	25%	0	0%	1	12%	2.88	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. Margaret R. Mahoney

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	4	57%	1	14%	0	0%	1	14%	1	14%	2.86	7	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3.00	5	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	3.00	5	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	60%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	2.80	5	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3.25	4	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3.25	4	0
Category Total	27	71%	1	3%	2	5%	7	18%	1	3%	3.21	38	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	3	50%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	3.25	4	0

Category Total	6	60%	2	20%	0	0%	2	20%	0	0%	3.20	10	
3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	3.00	6	0
13. Dignified	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
14. Courteous	4	67%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
16. Patient	3	50%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
Category Total	18	60%	8	27%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.40	30	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	5	83%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	3.50	6	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	5	71%	1	14%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	4	67%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	6	0
Category Total	14	74%	3	16%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	3.58	19	



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. Margaret R. Mahoney

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	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	12	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	12	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	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
Category Total	110	89%	14	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	124	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
Category Total	44	92%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	48	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
14. Dignified	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
15. Courteous	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
17. Patient	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
Category Total	78	98%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	80	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	12	75%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
Category Total	41	89%	3	7%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	46	