



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. Christopher O'Neil
Pinal County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 109 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 69 Returned: 52 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 211 Returned: 27 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	100%	99%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	98%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	99%
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. Christopher O'Neil

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	5	25%	10	50%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	20	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	3	16%	11	58%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	2.89	19	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	4	22%	10	56%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	18	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	4	21%	11	58%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.00	19	0
Category Total	16	21%	42	55%	18	24%	0	0%	0	0%	2.97	76	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	11	48%	11	48%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	59%	9	41%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	57%	8	38%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	65%	7	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	20	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	62%	8	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	65%	7	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	20	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	62%	8	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	65%	7	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	20	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	65%	7	35%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	20	0
Category Total	114	61%	72	38%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	188	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	9	38%	11	46%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.21	24	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	7	50%	6	43%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	15	63%	8	33%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
Category Total	31	50%	25	40%	6	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	62	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
18. Dignified	15	65%	6	26%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	23	0
19. Courteous	18	75%	5	21%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	12	52%	9	39%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	23	0
21. Patient	15	65%	7	30%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
Category Total	77	66%	31	27%	8	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	116	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	11	46%	11	46%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	24	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	8	35%	11	48%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	23	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	10	45%	11	50%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	22	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	13	57%	9	39%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	23	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	7	30%	12	52%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.13	23	0
Category Total	49	43%	54	47%	12	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	115	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	9	0
Category Total	4	44%	3	33%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	9	



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. Christopher O'Neil

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	21	81%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	26	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	85%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	26	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	22	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	85%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	26	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	23	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	21	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
Category Total	199	87%	13	6%	18	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	230	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	23	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	19	90%	0	0%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	21	0
Category Total	42	89%	1	2%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	47	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	23	85%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.70	27	0
13. Dignified	24	89%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
14. Courteous	24	89%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	24	92%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
16. Patient	24	92%	0	0%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	26	0
Category Total	119	89%	4	3%	8	6%	1	1%	1	1%	3.80	133	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	81%	2	8%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	23	88%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	26	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	22	88%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
Category Total	66	86%	4	5%	6	8%	1	1%	0	0%	3.75	77	



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. Christopher O'Neil

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	41	80%	10	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	51	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	44	86%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	51	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	45	88%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	51	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	40	85%	7	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	47	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	43	86%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	50	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	44	88%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	50	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	43	88%	6	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	49	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	41	87%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	47	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	40	87%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	46	0
Category Total	381	86%	61	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	442	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	47	90%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	52	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	38	75%	9	18%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.65	51	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	47	90%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	52	0
Category Total	132	85%	19	12%	3	2%	1	1%	0	0%	3.82	155	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	43	83%	9	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	52	0
14. Dignified	44	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	52	0
15. Courteous	44	86%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	51	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	44	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	52	0
17. Patient	44	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	52	0
Category Total	219	85%	40	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	259	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	40	77%	10	19%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	52	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	43	83%	9	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	52	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	43	83%	9	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	52	0
Category Total	126	81%	28	18%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	156	