



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.

Maricopa County Voters Only

Hon. Randall H. Warner
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2007

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 360 Returned: 104 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 27 Returned: 27 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 390 Returned: 85 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	100%
Communication	99%	100%	98%
Temperament	99%	99%	100%
Admin Performance	99%	100%	99%
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. Randall H. Warner

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	75	78%	16	17%	4	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.72	96	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	73	75%	18	19%	5	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.68	97	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	68	80%	14	16%	2	2%	1	1%	0	0%	3.75	85	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	79	81%	13	13%	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	3.74	97	0
Category Total	295	79%	61	16%	14	4%	5	1%	0	0%	3.72	375	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	82	80%	14	14%	5	5%	0	0%	1	1%	3.73	102	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	71	86%	11	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.82	83	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	74	84%	13	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.81	88	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	64	88%	8	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.84	73	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	68	86%	10	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.82	79	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	65	88%	8	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.84	74	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	68	84%	11	14%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	3.79	81	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	62	87%	8	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.83	71	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	69	83%	12	14%	0	0%	1	1%	1	1%	3.77	83	0
Category Total	623	85%	95	13%	6	1%	1	0%	9	1%	3.80	734	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	82	80%	16	16%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.75	102	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	73	83%	12	14%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	3.77	88	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	83	81%	16	16%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	3.76	102	0
Category Total	238	82%	44	15%	7	2%	0	0%	3	1%	3.76	292	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	75	76%	21	21%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	3.71	99	0
18. Dignified	83	81%	16	16%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	3.76	102	0
19. Courteous	82	80%	15	15%	4	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.74	102	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	83	83%	15	15%	1	1%	0	0%	1	1%	3.79	100	0
21. Patient	75	74%	19	19%	6	6%	0	0%	1	1%	3.65	101	0
Category Total	398	79%	86	17%	15	3%	0	0%	5	1%	3.73	504	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	79	79%	17	17%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.73	100	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	80	83%	15	16%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.80	96	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	82	85%	11	11%	1	1%	1	1%	1	1%	3.79	96	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	85	85%	12	12%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	3.80	100	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	78	84%	10	11%	4	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.76	93	0
Category Total	404	83%	65	13%	10	2%	1	0%	5	1%	3.78	485	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	31	86%	3	8%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.72	36	0
Category Total	31	86%	3	8%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.72	36	



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. Randall H. Warner

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	49	60%	29	35%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	82	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	45	60%	26	35%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	75	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	47	60%	27	35%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	78	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	42	62%	23	34%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	68	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	43	62%	23	33%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	69	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	45	63%	22	31%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	71	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	47	62%	25	33%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	76	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	39	60%	23	35%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	65	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	46	61%	25	33%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	75	0
Category Total	403	61%	223	34%	33	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	659	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	51	62%	26	32%	5	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	82	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	40	61%	21	32%	2	3%	3	5%	0	0%	3.48	66	0
Category Total	91	61%	47	32%	7	5%	3	2%	0	0%	3.53	148	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	50	60%	29	35%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	83	0
13. Dignified	52	62%	28	33%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	84	0
14. Courteous	53	63%	26	31%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.56	84	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	53	65%	25	30%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	82	0
16. Patient	53	63%	26	31%	5	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	84	0
Category Total	261	63%	134	32%	21	5%	1	0%	0	0%	3.57	417	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	54	67%	21	26%	4	5%	2	2%	0	0%	3.57	81	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	55	70%	20	25%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	79	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	55	68%	22	27%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.62	81	0
Category Total	164	68%	63	26%	11	5%	3	1%	0	0%	3.61	241	



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. Randall H. Warner

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	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	88%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	22	88%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	88%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	85%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	88%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	25	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	24	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	26	0
Category Total	206	88%	28	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	234	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	23	85%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	23	85%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	23	85%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
Category Total	69	85%	9	11%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	81	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	24	89%	2	7%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
14. Dignified	24	89%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
15. Courteous	24	89%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	89%	2	7%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	27	0
17. Patient	23	85%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
Category Total	119	88%	11	8%	4	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.84	135	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	22	81%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	24	89%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	27	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	22	81%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	27	0
Category Total	68	84%	13	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	81	