



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. Brenden Griffin
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2013

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 164 Returned: 42 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 27 Returned: 10 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 50 Returned: 12 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	93%
Communication	93%	100%	91%
Temperament	97%	100%	92%
Admin Performance	98%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	90%	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. Brenden Griffin

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	24	67%	6	17%	2	6%	4	11%	0	0%	3.39	36	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	23	66%	9	26%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	3.51	35	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	23	74%	4	13%	2	6%	0	0%	2	6%	3.48	31	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	27	71%	6	16%	2	5%	1	3%	2	5%	3.45	38	0
Category Total	97	69%	25	18%	7	5%	7	5%	4	3%	3.46	140	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	26	72%	6	17%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.58	36	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	86%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	87%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	19	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	95%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	20	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	22	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	17	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	90%	0	0%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
Category Total	177	89%	12	6%	7	4%	2	1%	0	0%	3.84	198	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	26	67%	7	18%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.49	39	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	25	68%	6	16%	2	5%	3	8%	1	3%	3.38	37	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	28	74%	7	18%	0	0%	2	5%	1	3%	3.55	38	0
Category Total	79	69%	20	18%	7	6%	6	5%	2	2%	3.47	114	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	24	67%	6	17%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	3.47	36	0
18. Dignified	27	69%	11	28%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	39	0
19. Courteous	28	72%	10	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	39	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	29	78%	4	11%	2	5%	1	3%	1	3%	3.59	37	0
21. Patient	27	73%	7	19%	0	0%	3	8%	0	0%	3.57	37	0
Category Total	135	72%	38	20%	9	5%	5	3%	1	1%	3.60	188	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	74%	10	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	39	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	29	74%	8	21%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	39	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	29	76%	6	16%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.61	38	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	28	72%	7	18%	2	5%	0	0%	2	5%	3.51	39	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	27	75%	7	19%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	36	0
Category Total	142	74%	38	20%	7	4%	1	1%	3	2%	3.65	191	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	7	70%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	3.40	10	0
Category Total	7	70%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	3.40	10	



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. Brenden Griffin

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	10	83%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.58	12	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	6	86%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	7	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	80%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	5	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	71%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%	3.29	7	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	3	60%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	3.00	5	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	9	82%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3.55	11	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	83%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	6	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	7	78%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	11%	3.44	9	0
Category Total	57	80%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	5	7%	3.59	71	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	10	83%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.58	12	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	10	91%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3.64	11	0
Category Total	20	87%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%	3.61	23	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	9	82%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	1	9%	3.55	11	0
13. Dignified	10	83%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.58	12	0
14. Courteous	10	83%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.58	12	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	10	83%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.58	12	0
16. Patient	10	83%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.58	12	0
Category Total	49	83%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	5	8%	3.58	59	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	10	83%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	12	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	82%	1	9%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
Category Total	29	83%	3	9%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	35	



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. Brenden Griffin

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	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	8	89%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	9	0
Category Total	73	83%	15	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	88	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
Category Total	27	90%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	30	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
14. Dignified	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
15. Courteous	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
17. Patient	8	80%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	10	0
Category Total	44	88%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	50	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
Category Total	27	90%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	30	