



**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. Susanna C. Pineda**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2007

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 410 Returned: 54 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 52 Returned: 23 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 636 Returned: 94 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	81%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	96%	100%	83%
Communication	87%	100%	77%
Temperament	91%	100%	78%
Admin Performance	94%	98%	84%
Settlement Activities	90%	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. Susanna C. Pineda

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	19	37%	10	20%	11	22%	8	16%	3	6%	2.67	51	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	17	34%	11	22%	13	26%	5	10%	4	8%	2.64	50	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	16	36%	11	24%	10	22%	6	13%	2	4%	2.73	45	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	16	33%	14	29%	10	20%	7	14%	2	4%	2.71	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2.69</b>	<b>195</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	25	47%	5	9%	15	28%	5	9%	3	6%	2.83	53	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	53%	7	15%	14	30%	1	2%	0	0%	3.19	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	25	50%	7	14%	14	28%	1	2%	3	6%	3.00	50	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	23	55%	5	12%	13	31%	0	0%	1	2%	3.17	42	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	24	53%	8	18%	12	27%	1	2%	0	0%	3.22	45	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	23	56%	5	12%	13	32%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	41	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	25	53%	8	17%	13	28%	0	0%	1	2%	3.19	47	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	23	55%	6	14%	13	31%	0	0%	0	0%	3.24	42	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	55%	7	15%	13	28%	1	2%	0	0%	3.23	47	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>414</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	21	40%	14	26%	12	23%	2	4%	4	8%	2.87	53	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	17	38%	10	22%	10	22%	6	13%	2	4%	2.76	45	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	46%	12	23%	10	19%	4	8%	2	4%	3.00	52	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2.88</b>	<b>150</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	43%	11	21%	12	23%	4	8%	3	6%	2.89	53	0
18. Dignified	24	44%	12	22%	13	24%	4	7%	1	2%	3.00	54	0
19. Courteous	26	48%	11	20%	15	28%	1	2%	1	2%	3.11	54	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	44%	9	17%	13	24%	6	11%	2	4%	2.87	54	0
21. Patient	27	50%	9	17%	15	28%	3	6%	0	0%	3.11	54	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>46%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.00</b>	<b>269</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	47%	14	26%	12	23%	2	4%	0	0%	3.17	53	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	25	47%	12	23%	12	23%	4	8%	0	0%	3.09	53	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	28	55%	12	24%	9	18%	1	2%	1	2%	3.27	51	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	26	49%	11	21%	12	23%	3	6%	1	2%	3.09	53	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	25	48%	13	25%	11	21%	2	4%	1	2%	3.13	52	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>262</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	48%	9	29%	4	13%	2	6%	1	3%	3.13	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>31</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. Susanna C. Pineda

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	30	38%	18	23%	7	9%	7	9%	16	21%	2.50	78	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	47%	15	21%	14	19%	4	6%	5	7%	2.96	72	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	36	47%	13	17%	9	12%	9	12%	10	13%	2.73	77	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	36	58%	12	19%	8	13%	3	5%	3	5%	3.21	62	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	35	55%	12	19%	11	17%	3	5%	3	5%	3.14	64	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	34	54%	11	17%	9	14%	4	6%	5	8%	3.03	63	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	38	54%	12	17%	12	17%	4	6%	4	6%	3.09	70	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	34	53%	11	17%	11	17%	5	8%	3	5%	3.06	64	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	36	49%	10	14%	10	14%	6	8%	11	15%	2.74	73	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>313</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>623</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	37	46%	17	21%	9	11%	8	10%	10	12%	2.78	81	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	37	51%	12	16%	7	10%	6	8%	11	15%	2.79	73	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>2.79</b>	<b>154</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>														
12. Understanding and compassion	34	43%	14	18%	9	11%	14	18%	9	11%	2.62	80	0	
13. Dignified	36	46%	17	22%	9	12%	5	6%	11	14%	2.79	78	0	
14. Courteous	38	51%	15	20%	10	13%	2	3%	10	13%	2.92	75	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	35	46%	13	17%	9	12%	6	8%	13	17%	2.67	76	0	
16. Patient	38	51%	14	19%	9	12%	3	4%	10	14%	2.91	74	0	
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>181</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>383</b>		
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	35	46%	15	20%	16	21%	5	7%	5	7%	2.92	76	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	39	51%	14	18%	14	18%	4	5%	6	8%	2.99	77	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	37	47%	14	18%	10	13%	8	10%	10	13%	2.76	79	0	
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>48%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>232</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. Susanna C. Pineda

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	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	20	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	21	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	21	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	21	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>198</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	23	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	23	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	23	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	23	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>69</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	21	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	23	0
14. Dignified	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
15. Courteous	23	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	23	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
17. Patient	23	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	23	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>97%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>115</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	17	77%	2	9%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	3.59	22	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	21	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	22	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	95%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>66</b>	