



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. Margaret LaBianca
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 115 Returned: 27 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 261 Returned: 23 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	100%
Communication	99%	n/a	98%
Temperament	99%	n/a	98%
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. Margaret LaBianca

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	14	61%	6	26%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	23	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	14	64%	6	27%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	22	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	16	70%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
Category Total	59	67%	22	25%	7	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	88	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	19	79%	2	8%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	11	85%	1	8%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	85%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	20	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	93%	0	0%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	14	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	92%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	12	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	89%	1	6%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	18	0
Category Total	120	88%	6	4%	11	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	137	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	19	76%	5	20%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	15	68%	6	27%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	22	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	19	73%	4	15%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.58	26	0
Category Total	53	73%	15	21%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	73	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	19	79%	3	13%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.67	24	0
18. Dignified	20	80%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
19. Courteous	19	73%	6	23%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	20	77%	4	15%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
21. Patient	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
Category Total	95	77%	21	17%	7	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.69	124	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	16	62%	7	27%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	26	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	20	77%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	26	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	15	68%	4	18%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	22	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	20	77%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	26	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	20	80%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
Category Total	91	73%	25	20%	9	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	125	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	13	72%	3	17%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	18	0
Category Total	13	72%	3	17%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	18	



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. Margaret LaBianca

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	16	73%	5	23%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	22	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	18	82%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	86%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	22	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	86%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
Category Total	171	88%	20	10%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	195	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	19	83%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	18	82%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	22	0
Category Total	37	82%	5	11%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.73	45	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
13. Dignified	21	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	22	0
14. Courteous	19	83%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	19	83%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
16. Patient	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
Category Total	99	87%	13	11%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%	3.83	114	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	20	87%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
Category Total	59	86%	7	10%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	69	