



**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. Christopher C. Browning**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 1998

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 371 Returned: 90 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 28 Returned: 21 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 663 Returned: 66 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	92%	100%	96%
Communication	95%	100%	96%
Temperament	89%	100%	95%
Admin Performance	96%	100%	96%
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. Christopher C. Browning

2022 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	38	43%	28	32%	17	19%	3	3%	2	2%	3.10	88	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	42	47%	29	32%	17	19%	2	2%	0	0%	3.23	90	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	40	48%	27	33%	14	17%	1	1%	1	1%	3.25	83	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	43	51%	28	33%	13	15%	1	1%	0	0%	3.33	85	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.23</b>	<b>346</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	37	42%	21	24%	21	24%	7	8%	2	2%	2.95	88	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	35	41%	27	32%	13	15%	7	8%	3	4%	2.99	85	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	38%	26	32%	20	24%	3	4%	2	2%	2.99	82	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	32	46%	22	31%	13	19%	2	3%	1	1%	3.17	70	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	33	44%	24	32%	13	17%	4	5%	1	1%	3.12	75	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	46%	26	37%	10	14%	0	0%	2	3%	3.24	71	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	43%	27	34%	16	20%	0	0%	2	3%	3.15	79	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	32	50%	19	30%	9	14%	2	3%	2	3%	3.20	64	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	39%	25	29%	13	15%	9	11%	5	6%	2.85	85	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>699</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	45	50%	29	32%	12	13%	2	2%	2	2%	3.26	90	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	40	56%	24	33%	6	8%	1	1%	1	1%	3.40	72	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	48	53%	26	29%	9	10%	3	3%	4	4%	3.23	90	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.29</b>	<b>252</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	26	29%	22	24%	25	28%	11	12%	6	7%	2.57	90	0
18. Dignified	44	49%	27	30%	14	16%	1	1%	4	4%	3.18	90	0
19. Courteous	47	52%	21	23%	14	16%	3	3%	5	6%	3.13	90	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	40	44%	27	30%	15	17%	4	4%	4	4%	3.06	90	0
21. Patient	32	37%	24	28%	20	23%	6	7%	5	6%	2.83	87	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>447</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	47	52%	26	29%	13	14%	3	3%	1	1%	3.28	90	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	50	56%	26	29%	13	14%	0	0%	1	1%	3.38	90	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	47	55%	25	29%	10	12%	2	2%	2	2%	3.31	86	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	49	54%	31	34%	7	8%	1	1%	2	2%	3.38	90	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	45	50%	29	32%	12	13%	2	2%	2	2%	3.26	90	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>446</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	18	37%	18	37%	10	20%	1	2%	2	4%	3.00	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>49</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. Christopher C. Browning

2022 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	34	54%	21	33%	5	8%	2	3%	1	2%	3.35	63	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	37	60%	18	29%	4	6%	2	3%	1	2%	3.42	62	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	37	59%	19	30%	5	8%	1	2%	1	2%	3.43	63	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	30	56%	18	33%	4	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.39	54	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	54%	20	34%	4	7%	2	3%	1	2%	3.36	59	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	34	59%	19	33%	2	3%	3	5%	0	0%	3.45	58	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	39	62%	18	29%	4	6%	1	2%	1	2%	3.48	63	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	31	56%	19	35%	3	5%	1	2%	1	2%	3.42	55	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	35	58%	17	28%	5	8%	2	3%	1	2%	3.38	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>537</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	39	65%	16	27%	3	5%	0	0%	2	3%	3.50	60	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	29	59%	12	24%	6	12%	1	2%	1	2%	3.37	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>109</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	36	60%	17	28%	3	5%	1	2%	3	5%	3.37	60	0
13. Dignified	40	65%	15	24%	5	8%	1	2%	1	2%	3.48	62	0
14. Courteous	40	65%	15	24%	3	5%	3	5%	1	2%	3.45	62	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	38	62%	16	26%	5	8%	1	2%	1	2%	3.46	61	0
16. Patient	36	61%	16	27%	3	5%	3	5%	1	2%	3.41	59	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>304</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	71%	15	25%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	3.63	59	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	42	72%	13	22%	1	2%	1	2%	1	2%	3.62	58	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	46	77%	9	15%	2	3%	1	2%	2	3%	3.60	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>177</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. Christopher C. Browning

2022 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	14	67%	7	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	15	71%	6	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	67%	7	33%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	63%	7	37%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	19	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	74%	5	26%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	19	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	15	71%	6	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	72%	5	28%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	18	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	68%	6	32%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>180</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	19	90%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>90%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.90</b>	<b>63</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	15	71%	6	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
14. Dignified	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
15. Courteous	16	76%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	21	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
17. Patient	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>73%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>105</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	16	76%	4	19%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	21	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	75%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	20	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>62</b>	