



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Richard Gordon
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2009

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 148 Returned: 45 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 44 Returned: 6 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	85%
Communication	99%	n/a	73%
Temperament	99%	n/a	83%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	83%
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. Richard Gordon

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	28	64%	12	27%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	44	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	26	62%	12	29%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	42	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	24	69%	10	29%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	28	72%	9	23%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	39	0
Category Total	106	66%	43	27%	11	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	160	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	32	73%	7	16%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.59	44	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	26	87%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	84%	3	9%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	32	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	91%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	21	84%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	26	81%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	32	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	20	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	79%	3	11%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	3.64	28	0
Category Total	212	83%	28	11%	11	4%	3	1%	0	0%	3.77	254	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	30	68%	10	23%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	44	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	24	69%	7	20%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	3.54	35	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	35	80%	6	14%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	44	0
Category Total	89	72%	23	19%	10	8%	1	1%	0	0%	3.63	123	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	33	75%	8	18%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.66	44	0
18. Dignified	35	80%	7	16%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	44	0
19. Courteous	34	79%	6	14%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	43	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	35	80%	6	14%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.70	44	0
21. Patient	33	75%	7	16%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	44	0
Category Total	170	78%	34	16%	13	6%	2	1%	0	0%	3.70	219	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	32	73%	10	23%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	44	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	31	70%	12	27%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	44	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	31	72%	7	16%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	43	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	34	77%	8	18%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	44	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	31	76%	7	17%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	41	0
Category Total	159	74%	44	20%	13	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	216	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	19	76%	4	16%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	25	0
Category Total	19	76%	4	16%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	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. Richard Gordon

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	50%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2.67	6	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	3	60%	1	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	5	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	3	60%	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	1	20%	2.80	5	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	3	60%	0	0%	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	3.20	5	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3.00	5	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	3.00	4	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	3.00	4	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	3.00	6	0
Category Total	27	59%	5	11%	7	15%	2	4%	5	11%	3.02	46	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	2.83	6	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	3	60%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	40%	2.40	5	0
Category Total	6	55%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	3	27%	2.64	11	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	4	67%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	3.17	6	0
13. Dignified	3	50%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	1	17%	3.00	6	0
14. Courteous	3	50%	2	33%	0	0%	1	17%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	2.83	6	0
16. Patient	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	3.00	6	0
Category Total	16	53%	7	23%	2	7%	2	7%	3	10%	3.03	30	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	3	50%	1	17%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	2.83	6	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	6	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	3	50%	1	17%	0	0%	1	17%	1	17%	2.67	6	0
Category Total	9	50%	3	17%	3	17%	1	6%	2	11%	2.89	18	