



**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. Samuel J. Myers**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Juvenile  
Appointed: 2007

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Myers 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: 175 Returned: 38 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 104 Returned: 25 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 422 Returned: 76 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	98%
Communication	100%	100%	95%
Temperament	100%	100%	96%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	99%
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. Samuel J. Myers

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	25	69%	8	22%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	3.58	36	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	27	75%	6	17%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	36	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	27	79%	5	15%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	34	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	27	75%	7	19%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	36	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.67</b>	<b>142</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	30	79%	6	16%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	38	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	32	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	37	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	32	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	37	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	27	87%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	29	88%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	33	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	28	88%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	32	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.86</b>	<b>315</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	27	73%	7	19%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	37	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	23	70%	9	27%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	33	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	28	74%	6	16%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.65</b>	<b>108</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	26	68%	11	29%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	38	0
18. Dignified	29	76%	9	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	38	0
19. Courteous	30	79%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	38	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	30	79%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	38	0
21. Patient	28	74%	8	21%	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>190</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	78%	8	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	37	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	32	86%	4	11%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	37	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	29	81%	5	14%	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	36	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	31	84%	5	14%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	37	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	31	86%	5	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	36	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.81</b>	<b>183</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	86%	1	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	14	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>86%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>14</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. Samuel J. Myers

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	36	53%	18	26%	11	16%	1	1%	2	3%	3.25	68	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	42	62%	16	24%	9	13%	1	1%	0	0%	3.46	68	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	42	63%	14	21%	10	15%	1	1%	0	0%	3.45	67	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	39	66%	10	17%	9	15%	0	0%	1	2%	3.46	59	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	39	64%	11	18%	10	16%	0	0%	1	2%	3.43	61	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	37	63%	11	19%	11	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	59	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	42	62%	13	19%	12	18%	0	0%	1	1%	3.40	68	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	38	67%	8	14%	11	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	57	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	40	61%	13	20%	11	17%	0	0%	2	3%	3.35	66	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>573</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	40	59%	13	19%	12	18%	2	3%	1	1%	3.31	68	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	32	57%	9	16%	12	21%	3	5%	0	0%	3.25	56	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>124</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	38	56%	15	22%	10	15%	3	4%	2	3%	3.24	68	0
13. Dignified	40	59%	16	24%	10	15%	1	1%	1	1%	3.37	68	0
14. Courteous	41	61%	14	21%	11	16%	1	1%	0	0%	3.42	67	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	42	64%	13	20%	9	14%	1	2%	1	2%	3.42	66	0
16. Patient	38	58%	15	23%	10	15%	0	0%	2	3%	3.34	65	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.36</b>	<b>334</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	43	65%	13	20%	9	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.47	66	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	46	69%	12	18%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	67	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	45	66%	13	19%	8	12%	0	0%	2	3%	3.46	68	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.49</b>	<b>201</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. Samuel J. Myers

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	20	80%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	80%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	80%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	79%	5	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	80%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	19	79%	5	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	20	80%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	19	79%	5	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	80%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.80</b>	<b>222</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	20	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	21	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>96%</b>	<b>3</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>71</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	23	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	25	0
14. Dignified	23	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	25	0
15. Courteous	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
17. Patient	24	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.94</b>	<b>125</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	23	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	25	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	23	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	25	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	92%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>92%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.92</b>	<b>75</b>	