



**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. Justin Beresky**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 161 Returned: 39 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 411 Returned: 26 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	n/a	97%
Communication	97%	n/a	84%
Temperament	91%	n/a	83%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	90%
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. Justin Beresky

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.			
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>													
1. Legal reasoning ability	18	49%	13	35%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	3.30	37	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	19	51%	12	32%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	3.32	37	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	17	49%	12	34%	5	14%	0	0%	1	3%	3.26	35	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	50%	12	32%	6	16%	1	3%	0	0%	3.29	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>147</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	19	49%	12	31%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	3.26	39	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	14	58%	8	33%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	47%	12	35%	4	12%	2	6%	0	0%	3.24	34	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	58%	6	32%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	19	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	52%	8	38%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	21	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	58%	6	32%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	19	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	57%	7	30%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	3.39	23	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	61%	5	28%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	56%	7	28%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.32	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>222</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	51%	12	31%	6	15%	0	0%	1	3%	3.28	39	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	45%	14	37%	6	16%	0	0%	1	3%	3.21	38	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	19	49%	12	31%	6	15%	1	3%	1	3%	3.21	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>116</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	17	44%	7	18%	11	28%	1	3%	3	8%	2.87	39	0
18. Dignified	20	51%	10	26%	7	18%	1	3%	1	3%	3.21	39	0
19. Courteous	20	51%	9	23%	7	18%	1	3%	2	5%	3.13	39	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	20	51%	8	21%	7	18%	1	3%	3	8%	3.05	39	0
21. Patient	18	46%	11	28%	6	15%	2	5%	2	5%	3.05	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>195</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	54%	13	33%	4	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.38	39	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	21	54%	12	31%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.36	39	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	62%	11	28%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	3.46	39	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	64%	8	21%	4	10%	2	5%	0	0%	3.44	39	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	23	62%	10	27%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	3.46	37	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.42</b>	<b>193</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	5	24%	11	52%	3	14%	1	5%	1	5%	2.86	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2.86</b>	<b>21</b>	



**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. Justin Beresky

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	13	54%	7	29%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.29	24	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	55%	6	30%	3	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	20	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	57%	6	26%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	3.30	23	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	62%	4	19%	3	14%	0	0%	1	5%	3.33	21	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	60%	5	25%	3	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	20	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	10	56%	6	33%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	63%	5	26%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	19	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	61%	5	28%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	62%	6	29%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>184</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	13	52%	5	20%	3	12%	3	12%	1	4%	3.04	25	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	10	53%	3	16%	3	16%	1	5%	2	11%	2.95	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>52%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>44</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	11	44%	7	28%	2	8%	3	12%	2	8%	2.88	25	0
13. Dignified	12	48%	8	32%	2	8%	3	12%	0	0%	3.16	25	0
14. Courteous	13	52%	6	24%	2	8%	4	16%	0	0%	3.12	25	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	14	56%	4	16%	2	8%	2	8%	3	12%	2.96	25	0
16. Patient	14	56%	5	20%	2	8%	3	12%	1	4%	3.12	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>125</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	65%	5	19%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.38	26	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	65%	4	15%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.42	26	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	65%	2	8%	2	8%	2	8%	3	12%	3.08	26	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>78</b>	