



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. Patrick Gard
Pinal County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 114 Returned: 35 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 62 Returned: 44 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 248 Returned: 36 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	99%	100%	100%
Temperament	99%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	99%	100%	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. Patrick Gard

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	13	45%	10	34%	6	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	29	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	10	37%	11	41%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	3.11	27	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	11	41%	11	41%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.19	27	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	40%	12	40%	4	13%	2	7%	0	0%	3.13	30	0
Category Total	46	41%	44	39%	19	17%	4	4%	0	0%	3.17	113	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	15	45%	11	33%	7	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	33	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	54%	11	39%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	28	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	54%	10	36%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	28	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	54%	9	38%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	54%	10	38%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	54%	9	38%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	24	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	59%	9	33%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	27	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	55%	8	36%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	22	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	54%	10	38%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
Category Total	127	53%	87	37%	24	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	238	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	14	42%	15	45%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	33	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	8	42%	8	42%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.26	19	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	16	48%	11	33%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	3.27	33	0
Category Total	38	45%	34	40%	12	14%	1	1%	0	0%	3.28	85	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	14	44%	9	28%	8	25%	1	3%	0	0%	3.12	32	0
18. Dignified	15	45%	13	39%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	33	0
19. Courteous	15	45%	11	33%	7	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	33	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	14	44%	11	34%	7	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.22	32	0
21. Patient	14	42%	10	30%	8	24%	1	3%	0	0%	3.12	33	0
Category Total	72	44%	54	33%	35	21%	2	1%	0	0%	3.20	163	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	55%	8	24%	5	15%	2	6%	0	0%	3.27	33	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	20	63%	6	19%	6	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	32	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	16	55%	9	31%	4	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	29	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	64%	6	18%	6	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	33	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	17	53%	8	25%	7	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	32	0
Category Total	92	58%	37	23%	28	18%	2	1%	0	0%	3.38	159	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	7	39%	9	50%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.28	18	0
Category Total	7	39%	9	50%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.28	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. Patrick Gard

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	25	71%	8	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	67%	8	24%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	33	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	23	68%	8	24%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	34	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	70%	7	23%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	30	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	21	68%	8	26%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	69%	7	24%	2	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	29	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	71%	7	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	31	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	21	68%	8	26%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	71%	7	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	31	0
Category Total	197	69%	68	24%	20	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	285	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	29	81%	5	14%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	36	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	23	74%	5	16%	3	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	31	0
Category Total	52	78%	10	15%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	67	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	25	69%	9	25%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	36	0
13. Dignified	25	71%	8	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
14. Courteous	25	71%	8	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	27	75%	7	19%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	36	0
16. Patient	27	77%	6	17%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	35	0
Category Total	129	73%	38	21%	10	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	177	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	71%	8	23%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	35	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	27	77%	6	17%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	35	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	27	77%	6	17%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	35	0
Category Total	79	75%	20	19%	6	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	105	



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. Patrick Gard

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	34	81%	7	17%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	42	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	33	80%	7	17%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	41	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	34	83%	6	15%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	41	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	32	82%	6	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	39	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	34	85%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	40	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	83%	6	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	40	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	35	85%	5	12%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	41	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	33	85%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	39	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	34	85%	5	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	40	0
Category Total	302	83%	52	14%	9	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	363	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	41	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	44	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	39	89%	4	9%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	44	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	40	91%	4	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	44	0
Category Total	120	91%	11	8%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	132	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	40	91%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	44	0
14. Dignified	40	91%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	44	0
15. Courteous	41	93%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	44	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	40	91%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	44	0
17. Patient	41	93%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	44	0
Category Total	202	92%	14	6%	4	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	220	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	33	75%	10	23%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	44	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	40	91%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	44	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	40	91%	2	5%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	44	0
Category Total	113	86%	14	11%	5	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	132	