



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. Timothy Thomason
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2014

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 236 Returned: 44 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 8 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 59 Returned: 19 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	100%
Communication	97%	n/a	100%
Temperament	100%	n/a	100%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	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. Timothy Thomason

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	30	73%	8	20%	1	2%	2	5%	0	0%	3.61	41	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	31	76%	6	15%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	3.61	41	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	25	74%	7	21%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	32	78%	6	15%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.68	41	0
Category Total	118	75%	27	17%	7	4%	5	3%	0	0%	3.64	157	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	35	81%	6	14%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.74	43	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	86%	1	5%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	90%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	15	88%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	85%	1	5%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	20	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	89%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	90%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	15	88%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	88%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	24	0
Category Total	194	87%	17	8%	11	5%	1	0%	0	0%	3.81	223	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	33	79%	6	14%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.69	42	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	26	74%	6	17%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	3.60	35	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	37	88%	2	5%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.79	42	0
Category Total	96	81%	14	12%	5	4%	4	3%	0	0%	3.70	119	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	33	77%	7	16%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	43	0
18. Dignified	37	84%	5	11%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	44	0
19. Courteous	37	84%	5	11%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	44	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	36	82%	5	11%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.73	44	0
21. Patient	35	80%	7	16%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	44	0
Category Total	178	81%	29	13%	11	5%	1	0%	0	0%	3.75	219	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	35	81%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	43	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	34	81%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	42	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	33	85%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	39	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	38	88%	3	7%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	43	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	34	87%	3	8%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	39	0
Category Total	174	84%	23	11%	9	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	206	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	8	67%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	0
Category Total	8	67%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	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. Timothy Thomason

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	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	14	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	14	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	16	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
Category Total	135	99%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.99	136	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	16	84%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	19	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
Category Total	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
13. Dignified	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
14. Courteous	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
16. Patient	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
Category Total	89	94%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	95	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
Category Total	54	95%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	57	