



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.

Pinal County Voters Only

Hon. Jason Holmberg
Pinal County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2013

100% of the Commission Voted Judge Holmberg 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: 17 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 56 Returned: 46 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 179 Returned: 21 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	95%
Communication	98%	100%	97%
Temperament	95%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	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. Jason Holmberg

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	88%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	16	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	10	71%	2	14%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	11	69%	3	19%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	16	0
Category Total	47	76%	9	15%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	62	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	13	76%	1	6%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	3.53	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	14	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	86%	0	0%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	14	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	12	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	86%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	85%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	86%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0
Category Total	107	86%	12	10%	5	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.80	125	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	14	82%	1	6%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	17	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	10	91%	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	13	81%	0	0%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	3.56	16	0
Category Total	37	84%	1	2%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	3.68	44	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	11	65%	1	6%	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.35	17	0
18. Dignified	12	75%	1	6%	3	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	16	0
19. Courteous	11	69%	1	6%	4	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	11	69%	2	13%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	3.44	16	0
21. Patient	10	67%	0	0%	2	13%	3	20%	0	0%	3.13	15	0
Category Total	55	69%	5	6%	16	20%	4	5%	0	0%	3.39	80	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	12	71%	3	18%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	17	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	12	75%	3	19%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	16	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	12	75%	2	13%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	13	81%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	16	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	11	69%	4	25%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	16	0
Category Total	60	74%	14	17%	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	81	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	10	63%	4	25%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	16	0
Category Total	10	62%	4	25%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	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. Jason Holmberg

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	16	80%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	75%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	3.50	20	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	75%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	1	5%	3.50	20	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	0
Category Total	130	75%	18	10%	18	10%	0	0%	8	5%	3.51	174	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	18	90%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	20	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	15	83%	0	0%	2	11%	0	0%	1	6%	3.56	18	0
Category Total	33	87%	0	0%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	3.68	38	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	14	70%	4	20%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	20	0
13. Dignified	14	70%	4	20%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	20	0
14. Courteous	17	81%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	17	81%	2	10%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
16. Patient	15	71%	3	14%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	21	0
Category Total	77	75%	15	15%	11	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	103	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	90%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	21	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	86%	0	0%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	18	86%	0	0%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
Category Total	55	87%	0	0%	8	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	63	



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. Jason Holmberg

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	40	87%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	46	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	39	85%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	46	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	39	85%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	46	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	39	87%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	39	87%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	39	87%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	39	87%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	45	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	37	86%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	43	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	84%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	45	0
Category Total	349	86%	48	12%	9	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	406	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	45	98%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	46	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	36	78%	7	15%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	46	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	45	98%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	46	0
Category Total	126	91%	7	5%	5	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	138	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	39	85%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	46	0
14. Dignified	42	91%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	46	0
15. Courteous	43	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	46	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	41	89%	5	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	46	0
17. Patient	40	87%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	46	0
Category Total	205	89%	25	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	230	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	40	87%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	46	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	42	91%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	46	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	42	91%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	46	0
Category Total	124	90%	14	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	138	