



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. Lori Horn Bustamante
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2014

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 174 Returned: 52 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 257 Returned: 44 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	97%	n/a	99%
Communication	97%	n/a	99%
Temperament	97%	n/a	98%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	99%
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. Lori Horn Bustamante

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	35	73%	9	19%	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	3.60	48	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	35	70%	10	20%	3	6%	2	4%	0	0%	3.56	50	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	29	69%	10	24%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	42	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	34	71%	11	23%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	48	0
Category Total	133	71%	40	21%	9	5%	6	3%	0	0%	3.60	188	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	41	82%	6	12%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.74	50	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	35	92%	0	0%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.82	38	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	39	81%	5	10%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.71	48	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	28	88%	1	3%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.75	32	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	91%	0	0%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.79	34	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	89%	1	3%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.78	37	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	87%	2	5%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.77	39	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	28	90%	0	0%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.77	31	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	35	85%	2	5%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.73	41	0
Category Total	304	87%	17	5%	20	6%	9	3%	0	0%	3.76	350	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	37	74%	10	20%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.66	50	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	31	74%	8	19%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.64	42	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	38	76%	7	14%	3	6%	2	4%	0	0%	3.62	50	0
Category Total	106	75%	25	18%	7	5%	4	3%	0	0%	3.64	142	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	38	75%	7	14%	4	8%	2	4%	0	0%	3.59	51	0
18. Dignified	40	78%	7	14%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.69	51	0
19. Courteous	41	80%	4	8%	5	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.67	51	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	39	76%	6	12%	5	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	51	0
21. Patient	38	76%	6	12%	4	8%	2	4%	0	0%	3.60	50	0
Category Total	196	77%	30	12%	21	8%	7	3%	0	0%	3.63	254	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	38	76%	8	16%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.66	50	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	36	75%	9	19%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.67	48	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	34	77%	7	16%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.68	44	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	40	82%	5	10%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.71	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	35	74%	7	15%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.62	47	0
Category Total	183	77%	36	15%	14	6%	5	2%	0	0%	3.67	238	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	18	67%	4	15%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.44	27	0
Category Total	18	67%	4	15%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.44	27	



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. Lori Horn Bustamante

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	34	77%	8	18%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.70	44	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	81%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	42	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	35	81%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	43	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	83%	6	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	40	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	36	86%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	42	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	36	84%	5	12%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.77	43	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	36	82%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	44	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	35	81%	7	16%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	43	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	34	77%	8	18%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.68	44	0
Category Total	313	81%	57	15%	12	3%	2	1%	1	0%	3.76	385	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	35	80%	6	14%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.70	44	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	27	82%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	33	0
Category Total	62	81%	10	13%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.73	77	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	36	82%	5	11%	2	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.70	44	0
13. Dignified	35	80%	6	14%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	44	0
14. Courteous	36	82%	5	11%	2	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.70	44	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	37	86%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.77	43	0
16. Patient	37	84%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.75	44	0
Category Total	181	83%	25	11%	9	4%	0	0%	4	2%	3.73	219	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	38	86%	5	11%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	44	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	37	84%	5	11%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	44	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	36	82%	6	14%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.75	44	0
Category Total	111	84%	16	12%	4	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.80	132	