



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. Daniel G. Martin
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Civil
Appointed: 2007

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 511 Returned: 107 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 28 Returned: 15 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 159 Returned: 25 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	100%	93%
Communication	97%	100%	88%
Temperament	98%	100%	94%
Admin Performance	99%	100%	96%
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. Daniel G. Martin

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	68	72%	19	20%	4	4%	2	2%	2	2%	3.57	95	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	68	73%	18	19%	4	4%	1	1%	2	2%	3.60	93	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	60	82%	9	12%	3	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.74	73	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	76	75%	18	18%	7	7%	0	0%	1	1%	3.65	102	0
Category Total	272	75%	64	18%	18	5%	3	1%	6	2%	3.63	363	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	85	82%	12	12%	4	4%	1	1%	2	2%	3.70	104	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	46	90%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	51	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	55	83%	9	14%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	66	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	47	90%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	52	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	48	91%	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	53	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	43	90%	5	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	48	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	62	91%	5	7%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	68	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	44	92%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	48	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	50	86%	7	12%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%	3.83	58	0
Category Total	480	88%	57	10%	7	1%	2	0%	2	0%	3.84	548	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	81	77%	19	18%	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	3.70	105	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	63	67%	22	23%	4	4%	5	5%	0	0%	3.52	94	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	92	88%	10	10%	1	1%	2	2%	0	0%	3.83	105	0
Category Total	236	78%	51	17%	8	3%	9	3%	0	0%	3.69	304	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	81	82%	11	11%	5	5%	1	1%	1	1%	3.72	99	0
18. Dignified	92	89%	7	7%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.83	103	0
19. Courteous	96	91%	4	4%	3	3%	1	1%	1	1%	3.84	105	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	92	88%	7	7%	2	2%	3	3%	1	1%	3.77	105	0
21. Patient	89	86%	9	9%	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	3.80	103	0
Category Total	450	87%	38	7%	16	3%	7	1%	4	1%	3.79	515	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	89	85%	13	12%	2	2%	0	0%	1	1%	3.80	105	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	85	83%	14	14%	3	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.78	103	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	75	75%	14	14%	10	10%	0	0%	1	1%	3.62	100	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	90	86%	10	10%	2	2%	3	3%	0	0%	3.78	105	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	81	80%	16	16%	3	3%	0	0%	1	1%	3.74	101	0
Category Total	420	82%	67	13%	20	4%	4	1%	3	1%	3.75	514	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	26	81%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	32	0
Category Total	26	81%	5	16%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	32	



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. Daniel G. Martin

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	15	60%	4	16%	4	16%	0	0%	2	8%	3.20	25	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	9	64%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.36	14	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	72%	3	17%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	3.50	18	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	10	67%	3	20%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.40	15	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	64%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.36	14	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	69%	2	15%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.38	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	11	61%	4	22%	2	11%	0	0%	1	6%	3.33	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	9	69%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	3.46	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	10	59%	3	18%	3	18%	0	0%	1	6%	3.24	17	0
Category Total	95	65%	28	19%	14	10%	0	0%	10	7%	3.35	147	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	17	68%	2	8%	4	16%	0	0%	2	8%	3.28	25	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	11	61%	2	11%	2	11%	2	11%	1	6%	3.11	18	0
Category Total	28	65%	4	9%	6	14%	2	5%	3	7%	3.21	43	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	16	67%	4	17%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.38	24	0	
13. Dignified	17	68%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	3.40	25	0	
14. Courteous	17	68%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	3.40	25	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	17	68%	3	12%	3	12%	1	4%	1	4%	3.36	25	0	
16. Patient	18	72%	3	12%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.48	25	0	
Category Total	85	69%	16	13%	16	13%	2	2%	5	4%	3.40	124		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	68%	4	16%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.44	25	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	72%	3	12%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	25	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	74%	3	13%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.48	23	0	
Category Total	52	71%	10	14%	8	11%	1	1%	2	3%	3.49	73		



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. Daniel G. Martin

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	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	12	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	11	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	12	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
Category Total	111	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	111	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	14	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	14	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	13	87%	0	0%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	15	0

12. Clearly explained the juror"s responsibilities	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0
Category Total	41	93%	1	2%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	44	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
14. Dignified	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
15. Courteous	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
17. Patient	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
Category Total	75	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	75	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	13	87%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	15	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	15	0
Category Total	43	96%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	45	