



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. Peter A. Thompson
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2010

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 318 Returned: 48 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 37 Returned: 18 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 169 Returned: 19 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	97%
Communication	98%	100%	94%
Temperament	96%	100%	95%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	96%	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. Peter A. Thompson

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	20	44%	18	40%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3.27	45	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	19	43%	18	41%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3.20	44	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	19	46%	14	34%	6	15%	1	2%	1	2%	3.20	41	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	22	48%	16	35%	6	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.24	46	0
Category Total	80	45%	66	38%	23	13%	4	2%	3	2%	3.23	176	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	25	53%	16	34%	4	9%	2	4%	0	0%	3.36	47	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	60%	11	26%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.43	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	53%	12	28%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	3.30	43	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	61%	10	24%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	41	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	25	60%	11	26%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.43	42	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	63%	10	25%	5	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	40	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	57%	11	26%	7	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	42	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	25	61%	10	24%	6	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	41	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	25	60%	11	26%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.43	42	0
Category Total	222	58%	102	27%	49	13%	7	2%	0	0%	3.42	380	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	24	51%	18	38%	3	6%	2	4%	0	0%	3.36	47	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	21	55%	13	34%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.42	38	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	29	62%	13	28%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	47	0
Category Total	74	56%	44	33%	11	8%	3	2%	0	0%	3.43	132	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	28	61%	10	22%	6	13%	2	4%	0	0%	3.39	46	0
18. Dignified	31	66%	10	21%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	3.51	47	0
19. Courteous	30	64%	10	21%	5	11%	2	4%	0	0%	3.45	47	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	30	64%	10	21%	5	11%	2	4%	0	0%	3.45	47	0
21. Patient	26	55%	13	28%	6	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.32	47	0
Category Total	145	62%	53	23%	27	12%	8	3%	1	0%	3.42	234	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	23	49%	17	36%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.34	47	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	27	57%	15	32%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	47	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	20	47%	17	40%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.30	43	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	29	62%	12	26%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.49	47	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	27	57%	13	28%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	47	0
Category Total	126	55%	74	32%	30	13%	1	0%	0	0%	3.41	231	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	13	52%	9	36%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.32	25	0
Category Total	13	52%	9	36%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.32	25	



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. Peter A. Thompson

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	58%	5	26%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.32	19	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	53%	6	40%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	15	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	56%	6	38%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.38	16	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	15	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	60%	6	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	56%	6	38%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.38	16	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	10	59%	6	35%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.41	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	7	50%	6	43%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	63%	5	31%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.44	16	0
Category Total	82	57%	52	36%	4	3%	0	0%	5	3%	3.44	143	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	13	68%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.53	19	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	10	67%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.40	15	0
Category Total	23	68%	8	24%	1	3%	0	0%	2	6%	3.47	34	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	12	63%	4	21%	1	5%	1	5%	1	5%	3.32	19	0
13. Dignified	11	58%	7	37%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.42	19	0
14. Courteous	13	68%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.53	19	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	13	68%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.53	19	0
16. Patient	13	72%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
Category Total	62	66%	26	28%	1	1%	1	1%	4	4%	3.50	94	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	14	74%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.58	19	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	14	74%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%	3.58	19	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	13	68%	4	21%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
Category Total	41	72%	12	21%	1	2%	0	0%	3	5%	3.54	57	



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. Peter A. Thompson

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	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
Category Total	151	93%	11	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	162	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	18	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	18	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
Category Total	52	96%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	54	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
14. Dignified	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
15. Courteous	18	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	18	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
17. Patient	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
Category Total	82	91%	8	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	90	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
Category Total	48	89%	6	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	54	