



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. Christopher A. Coury
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2010

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 166 Returned: 40 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 65 Returned: 13 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	97%	n/a	100%
Communication	92%	n/a	100%
Temperament	93%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	97%	n/a	100%
Settlement Activities	94%	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. Christopher A. Coury

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	22	67%	8	24%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.48	33	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	20	61%	10	30%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.42	33	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	16	64%	5	20%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.36	25	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	58%	7	21%	3	9%	3	9%	1	3%	3.21	33	0
Category Total	77	62%	30	24%	7	6%	6	5%	4	3%	3.37	124	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	67%	7	19%	2	6%	2	6%	1	3%	3.42	36	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	71%	4	19%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	3.52	21	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	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	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	12	67%	4	22%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	18	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	87%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	15	0
Category Total	114	76%	27	18%	5	3%	2	1%	2	1%	3.66	150	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	24	62%	9	23%	3	8%	2	5%	1	3%	3.36	39	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	19	63%	7	23%	2	7%	1	3%	1	3%	3.40	30	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	67%	7	19%	2	6%	1	3%	2	6%	3.39	36	0
Category Total	67	64%	23	22%	7	7%	4	4%	4	4%	3.38	105	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	66%	6	17%	3	9%	1	3%	2	6%	3.34	35	0
18. Dignified	26	68%	10	26%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.61	38	0
19. Courteous	25	68%	9	24%	2	5%	0	0%	1	3%	3.54	37	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	25	68%	6	16%	2	5%	2	5%	2	5%	3.35	37	0
21. Patient	26	72%	5	14%	2	6%	0	0%	3	8%	3.42	36	0
Category Total	125	68%	36	20%	10	5%	4	2%	8	4%	3.45	183	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	66%	9	24%	1	3%	3	8%	0	0%	3.47	38	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	23	70%	8	24%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	33	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	23	70%	9	27%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	33	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	27	73%	7	19%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.62	37	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	22	65%	8	24%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.50	34	0
Category Total	120	69%	41	23%	9	5%	5	3%	0	0%	3.58	175	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	75%	2	13%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.56	16	0
Category Total	12	75%	2	12%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	3.56	16	



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. Christopher A. Coury

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	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	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	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	10	91%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	11	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	11	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	12	0
Category Total	101	91%	10	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	111	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	11	85%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	90%	0	0%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
Category Total	20	87%	1	4%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
13. Dignified	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
14. Courteous	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
16. Patient	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
Category Total	60	92%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	65	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	11	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	12	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
Category Total	34	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	38	