



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. Javier Chon-Lopez
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2007

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 387 Returned: 73 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 64 Returned: 48 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 298 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	94%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	98%	100%	100%
Temperament	98%	100%	99%
Admin Performance	94%	100%	100%
Settlement Activities	91%	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. Javier Chon-Lopez

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.			
1. Legal Ability													
1. Legal reasoning ability	27	38%	26	37%	12	17%	5	7%	1	1%	3.03	71	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	23	33%	26	37%	16	23%	4	6%	1	1%	2.94	70	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	25	37%	25	37%	13	19%	3	4%	1	1%	3.04	67	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	29	42%	21	30%	17	25%	1	1%	1	1%	3.10	69	0
Category Total	104	38%	98	35%	58	21%	13	5%	4	1%	3.03	277	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	37	51%	26	36%	9	12%	1	1%	0	0%	3.36	73	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	38	56%	24	35%	6	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	68	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	36	55%	25	38%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	66	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	63%	16	31%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	52	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	34	58%	23	39%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	59	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	60%	20	36%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	55	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	36	55%	26	39%	3	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.47	66	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	33	61%	18	33%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	54	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	35	55%	26	41%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	64	0
Category Total	315	57%	204	37%	36	6%	2	0%	0	0%	3.49	557	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	30	41%	25	34%	15	21%	2	3%	1	1%	3.11	73	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	24	48%	18	36%	7	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.28	50	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	35	48%	24	33%	14	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	73	0
Category Total	89	45%	67	34%	36	18%	2	1%	2	1%	3.22	196	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	39	53%	25	34%	6	8%	3	4%	0	0%	3.37	73	0
18. Dignified	38	54%	24	34%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	71	0
19. Courteous	39	54%	24	33%	7	10%	2	3%	0	0%	3.39	72	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	35	49%	25	35%	7	10%	4	6%	0	0%	3.28	71	0
21. Patient	36	49%	27	37%	10	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	73	0
Category Total	187	52%	125	35%	39	11%	9	2%	0	0%	3.36	360	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	35%	24	33%	19	26%	4	6%	0	0%	2.97	72	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	27	38%	26	36%	18	25%	1	1%	0	0%	3.10	72	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	29	45%	20	31%	11	17%	3	5%	1	2%	3.14	64	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	32	45%	27	38%	9	13%	3	4%	0	0%	3.24	71	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	21	30%	18	26%	22	32%	8	12%	0	0%	2.75	69	0
Category Total	134	39%	115	33%	79	23%	19	5%	1	0%	3.04	348	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	9	41%	6	27%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	3.00	22	0
Category Total	9	41%	6	27%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	3.00	22	



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. Javier Chon-Lopez

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	77%	3	14%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	22	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	76%	3	14%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	17	77%	3	14%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	22	0
Category Total	158	78%	27	13%	18	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	203	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	15	65%	4	17%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	23	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	10	56%	4	22%	4	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	18	0
Category Total	25	61%	8	20%	8	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	41	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	18	78%	3	13%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
13. Dignified	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
14. Courteous	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	19	83%	2	9%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
16. Patient	19	83%	2	9%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	23	0
Category Total	94	82%	11	10%	9	8%	1	1%	0	0%	3.72	115	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	74%	4	17%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	23	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	74%	5	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	23	0
Category Total	51	74%	13	19%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	69	



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. Javier Chon-Lopez

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	35	73%	13	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	48	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	36	78%	10	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	46	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	38	79%	10	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	48	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	34	77%	10	23%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	44	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	35	76%	11	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	46	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	37	79%	10	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	37	79%	10	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	47	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	35	81%	8	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	43	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	37	80%	9	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	46	0
Category Total	324	78%	91	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	415	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	40	83%	7	15%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	48	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	37	77%	9	19%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	48	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	41	85%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	48	0
Category Total	118	82%	22	15%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	144	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	37	77%	10	21%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	48	0
14. Dignified	40	83%	7	15%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	48	0
15. Courteous	41	85%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	48	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	41	85%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	48	0
17. Patient	40	83%	7	15%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	48	0
Category Total	199	83%	36	15%	5	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	240	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	35	73%	8	17%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	48	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	41	85%	6	13%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	48	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	40	83%	7	15%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	48	0
Category Total	116	81%	21	15%	7	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	144	