



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. Jay Adleman

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Criminal

Appointed: 2013

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 107 Returned: 20 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 54 Returned: 8 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 54 Returned: 4 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	100%	99%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	100%	99%	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. Jay Adleman

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	14	70%	6	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	14	74%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	19	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	14	74%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	19	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	0
Category Total	56	74%	20	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	76	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	15	83%	3	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
Category Total	134	85%	23	15%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	158	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	14	78%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	18	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
Category Total	44	76%	12	21%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	58	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
18. Dignified	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
19. Courteous	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
21. Patient	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
Category Total	75	75%	24	24%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	100	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	15	75%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
Category Total	75	75%	25	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	100	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	71%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	17	0
Category Total	12	71%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	17	



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. Jay Adleman

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	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	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	2	67%	1	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	3	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	1	50%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	2	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	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	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	2	0
Category Total	16	80%	4	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	20	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	1	0
Category Total	5	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	5	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
13. Dignified	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
14. Courteous	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	3	75%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	4	0
16. Patient	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
Category Total	18	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	20	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	4	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	4	0
Category Total	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	12	



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. Jay Adleman

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	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	85%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	79%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	81%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	27	0
Category Total	193	82%	33	14%	9	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	235	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	26	93%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	23	85%	3	11%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.78	27	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	26	93%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	28	0
Category Total	75	90%	5	6%	2	2%	1	1%	0	0%	3.86	83	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
14. Dignified	23	82%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	28	0
15. Courteous	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
17. Patient	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
Category Total	116	85%	19	14%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	137	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	22	79%	2	7%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.61	28	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	26	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	27	0
Category Total	74	90%	4	5%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.84	82	