



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Greg Sakall
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2017

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 97 Returned: 37 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 353 Returned: 44 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	n/a	96%
Communication	100%	n/a	96%
Temperament	100%	n/a	94%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	98%
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. Greg Sakall

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	31	84%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	37	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	32	86%	3	8%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	37	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	32	91%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	35	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	32	89%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
Category Total	127	88%	13	9%	5	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	145	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	32	86%	3	8%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	37	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	24	92%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	26	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	91%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	34	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	91%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	23	92%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	92%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	26	90%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	29	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	90%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	21	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	27	90%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	30	0
Category Total	226	90%	13	5%	11	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	250	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	33	89%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	37	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	27	87%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	31	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	33	89%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	37	0
Category Total	93	89%	8	8%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	105	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	31	84%	4	11%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	37	0
18. Dignified	32	86%	3	8%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	37	0
19. Courteous	34	94%	0	0%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	33	89%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	37	0
21. Patient	31	86%	3	8%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	36	0
Category Total	161	88%	12	7%	10	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	183	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	33	89%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	37	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	31	86%	3	8%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	36	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	30	88%	2	6%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	34	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	32	89%	2	6%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	36	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	29	91%	1	3%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
Category Total	155	89%	10	6%	10	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	175	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	26	84%	2	6%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	31	0
Category Total	26	84%	2	6%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	31	



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. Greg Sakall

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	24	57%	13	31%	1	2%	1	2%	3	7%	3.29	42	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	66%	9	24%	3	8%	0	0%	1	3%	3.50	38	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	66%	9	22%	2	5%	1	2%	2	5%	3.41	41	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	69%	9	25%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.58	36	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	27	73%	8	22%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.62	37	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	71%	8	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	26	68%	9	24%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.58	38	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	23	68%	9	26%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	34	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	23	61%	10	26%	3	8%	1	3%	1	3%	3.39	38	0
Category Total	225	66%	84	25%	17	5%	4	1%	9	3%	3.51	339	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	28	67%	9	21%	3	7%	2	5%	0	0%	3.50	42	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	26	65%	9	23%	4	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.50	40	0
Category Total	54	66%	18	22%	7	9%	3	4%	0	0%	3.50	82	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	30	71%	8	19%	1	2%	1	2%	2	5%	3.50	42	0
13. Dignified	29	69%	9	21%	2	5%	1	2%	1	2%	3.52	42	0
14. Courteous	28	68%	10	24%	2	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.56	41	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	27	61%	10	23%	2	5%	2	5%	3	7%	3.27	44	0
16. Patient	27	64%	11	26%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.52	42	0
Category Total	141	67%	48	23%	10	5%	5	2%	7	3%	3.47	211	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	31	72%	8	19%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	43	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	31	72%	8	19%	2	5%	1	2%	1	2%	3.56	43	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	33	77%	8	19%	1	2%	0	0%	1	2%	3.67	43	0
Category Total	95	74%	24	19%	7	5%	1	1%	2	2%	3.62	129	