



**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. John Hinderaker**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2018

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2020	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 201 Returned: 51 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 59 Returned: 38 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 244 Returned: 46 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	98%
Communication	98%	99%	96%
Temperament	97%	100%	96%
Admin Performance	97%	100%	98%
Settlement Activities	94%	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. John Hinderaker

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	12	26%	23	50%	10	22%	1	2%	0	0%	3.00	46	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	11	26%	16	37%	15	35%	1	2%	0	0%	2.86	43	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	12	29%	13	32%	14	34%	2	5%	0	0%	2.85	41	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	28%	15	35%	12	28%	4	9%	0	0%	2.81	43	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>173</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	24	49%	17	35%	7	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.29	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	48%	15	36%	7	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	42	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	54%	12	29%	7	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.37	41	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	50%	12	30%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	3.28	40	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	52%	13	31%	7	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	42	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	50%	12	32%	7	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	38	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	50%	13	33%	7	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	40	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	51%	11	30%	7	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	37	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	51%	13	32%	7	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.34	41	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>370</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	42%	21	44%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	3.25	48	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	13	42%	11	35%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	3.16	31	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	50%	14	29%	9	19%	1	2%	0	0%	3.27	48	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.24</b>	<b>127</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	46%	18	36%	8	16%	0	0%	1	2%	3.24	50	0
18. Dignified	25	50%	18	36%	6	12%	0	0%	1	2%	3.32	50	0
19. Courteous	27	54%	16	32%	6	12%	0	0%	1	2%	3.36	50	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	48%	19	38%	6	12%	0	0%	1	2%	3.30	50	0
21. Patient	27	55%	13	27%	6	12%	2	4%	1	2%	3.29	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.30</b>	<b>249</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	21	42%	19	38%	9	18%	1	2%	0	0%	3.20	50	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	22	44%	18	36%	9	18%	1	2%	0	0%	3.22	50	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	20	47%	15	35%	6	14%	2	5%	0	0%	3.23	43	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	27	55%	15	31%	6	12%	1	2%	0	0%	3.39	49	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	18	37%	16	33%	13	27%	2	4%	0	0%	3.02	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>45%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>241</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	9	50%	3	17%	5	28%	1	6%	0	0%	3.11	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>18</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. John Hinderaker

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	28	64%	12	27%	2	5%	1	2%	1	2%	3.48	44	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	28	67%	11	26%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.57	42	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	27	66%	10	24%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.54	41	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	27	68%	10	25%	2	5%	1	3%	0	0%	3.58	40	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	28	68%	9	22%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.56	41	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	27	66%	9	22%	5	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	41	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	67%	10	24%	3	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.55	42	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	25	66%	9	24%	3	8%	1	3%	0	0%	3.53	38	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	25	64%	9	23%	4	10%	1	3%	0	0%	3.49	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>368</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	30	70%	10	23%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	43	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	26	67%	9	23%	2	5%	1	3%	1	3%	3.49	39	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>82</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	29	67%	11	26%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	3.53	43	0
13. Dignified	31	70%	10	23%	1	2%	2	5%	0	0%	3.59	44	0
14. Courteous	30	68%	11	25%	1	2%	2	5%	0	0%	3.57	44	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	30	68%	12	27%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%	3.59	44	0
16. Patient	32	73%	9	20%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.64	44	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>69%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>219</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	30	70%	10	23%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.60	43	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	31	72%	9	21%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.63	43	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	32	73%	9	20%	3	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	44	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.63</b>	<b>130</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. John Hinderaker

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.			
<b>1. Integrity</b>													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	36	95%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	38	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	36	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	37	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	37	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	38	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	35	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	36	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	36	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	37	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	36	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	37	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	37	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	38	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	34	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	34	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	37	97%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>333</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	36	95%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	38	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	33	87%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.82	38	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	36	95%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>114</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	36	95%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	38	0
14. Dignified	36	95%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	38	0
15. Courteous	36	95%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	38	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	36	95%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	38	0
17. Patient	36	95%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>190</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	33	87%	5	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	38	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	36	95%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	38	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	36	95%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>114</b>	