



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. Suzanne Marwil
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 181 Returned: 50 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 420 Returned: 51 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	94%	n/a	96%
Communication	87%	n/a	90%
Temperament	92%	n/a	93%
Admin Performance	99%	n/a	91%
Settlement Activities	97%	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. Suzanne Marwil

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	16	32%	20	40%	10	20%	3	6%	1	2%	2.94	50	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	15	31%	17	35%	14	29%	1	2%	1	2%	2.92	48	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	16	43%	14	38%	6	16%	1	3%	0	0%	3.22	37	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	15	34%	18	41%	9	20%	2	5%	0	0%	3.05	44	0
Category Total	62	35%	69	39%	39	22%	7	4%	2	1%	3.02	179	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	18	36%	13	26%	14	28%	5	10%	0	0%	2.88	50	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	19	63%	5	17%	5	17%	0	0%	1	3%	3.37	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	19	43%	10	23%	11	25%	3	7%	1	2%	2.98	44	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	18	64%	6	21%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	28	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	68%	4	14%	4	14%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	59%	5	19%	4	15%	1	4%	1	4%	3.26	27	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	19	59%	7	22%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	3.38	32	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	17	68%	5	20%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	25	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	18	46%	12	31%	6	15%	3	8%	0	0%	3.15	39	0
Category Total	163	54%	67	22%	56	18%	14	5%	3	1%	3.23	303	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	14	28%	19	38%	13	26%	4	8%	0	0%	2.86	50	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	12	28%	14	33%	10	23%	6	14%	1	2%	2.70	43	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	18	36%	15	30%	10	20%	7	14%	0	0%	2.88	50	0
Category Total	44	31%	48	34%	33	23%	17	12%	1	1%	2.82	143	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	19	39%	15	31%	12	24%	3	6%	0	0%	3.02	49	0
18. Dignified	21	44%	19	40%	5	10%	3	6%	0	0%	3.21	48	0
19. Courteous	21	43%	18	37%	7	14%	3	6%	0	0%	3.16	49	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	18	37%	16	33%	9	18%	6	12%	0	0%	2.94	49	0
21. Patient	21	43%	14	29%	10	20%	4	8%	0	0%	3.06	49	0
Category Total	100	41%	82	34%	43	18%	19	8%	0	0%	3.08	244	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	43%	21	43%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	49	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	17	35%	20	42%	9	19%	2	4%	0	0%	3.08	48	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	18	41%	18	41%	7	16%	1	2%	0	0%	3.20	44	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	47%	18	37%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	18	39%	18	39%	10	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	46	0
Category Total	97	41%	95	40%	41	17%	3	1%	0	0%	3.21	236	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	13	34%	14	37%	10	26%	1	3%	0	0%	3.03	38	0
Category Total	13	34%	14	37%	10	26%	1	3%	0	0%	3.03	38	



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. Suzanne Marwil

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	69%	3	6%	8	16%	3	6%	1	2%	3.35	49	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	79%	5	12%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	43	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	34	71%	4	8%	5	10%	5	10%	0	0%	3.40	48	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	34	81%	4	10%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	42	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	33	79%	4	10%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	42	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	35	78%	5	11%	3	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.60	45	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	76%	5	11%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	45	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	32	80%	5	13%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	40	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	30	70%	5	12%	5	12%	3	7%	0	0%	3.44	43	0
Category Total	300	76%	40	10%	43	11%	12	3%	2	1%	3.57	397	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	33	66%	6	12%	8	16%	2	4%	1	2%	3.36	50	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	29	69%	3	7%	4	10%	5	12%	1	2%	3.29	42	0
Category Total	62	67%	9	10%	12	13%	7	8%	2	2%	3.33	92	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	30	60%	7	14%	7	14%	4	8%	2	4%	3.18	50	0
13. Dignified	34	69%	4	8%	10	20%	1	2%	0	0%	3.45	49	0
14. Courteous	34	69%	4	8%	8	16%	3	6%	0	0%	3.41	49	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	34	68%	3	6%	7	14%	4	8%	2	4%	3.26	50	0
16. Patient	31	63%	6	12%	10	20%	2	4%	0	0%	3.35	49	0
Category Total	163	66%	24	10%	42	17%	14	6%	4	2%	3.33	247	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	34	68%	4	8%	7	14%	4	8%	1	2%	3.32	50	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	35	70%	5	10%	6	12%	2	4%	2	4%	3.38	50	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	34	68%	3	6%	9	18%	1	2%	3	6%	3.28	50	0
Category Total	103	69%	12	8%	22	15%	7	5%	6	4%	3.33	150	