



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. Kent Cattani
Court of Appeals Division I
Appointed: 2013

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

[View Decisions](#)

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 605 Returned: 154 Score (See Footnote)	Peer Judge Surveys Distributed: 30 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)	Superior Court Judge Surveys Distributed: 289 Returned: 105 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	84%	100%	99%
Integrity	96%	100%	100%
Communication	98%	100%	n/a
Temperament	98%	100%	n/a
Admin Performance	88%	100%	100%

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. Kent Cattani

2022 Attorney Survey Responses

Key: **SU** = Superior **VG** = Very Good **SA** = Satisfactory **PO** = Poor **UN** = Unsatisfactory

	SU		VG		SA		PO		UN		Mean	Total
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.		
1. Legal Ability												
1. Legal reasoning ability	49	58%	15	18%	6	7%	4	5%	10	12%	3.06	84
2. Knowledge of law	47	57%	17	20%	9	11%	2	2%	8	10%	3.12	83
3. Decisions based on laws and facts	48	57%	14	17%	8	10%	5	6%	9	11%	3.04	84
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	48	57%	14	17%	7	8%	7	8%	8	10%	3.04	84
Category Total	192	57%	60	18%	30	9%	18	5%	35	10%	3.06	335
2. Integrity												
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	44	61%	13	18%	5	7%	5	7%	5	7%	3.19	72
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	31	84%	5	14%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.78	37
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	35	80%	6	14%	2	5%	1	2%	0	0%	3.70	44
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	31	86%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.78	36
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	89%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	36
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	33	87%	4	11%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.82	38
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	37	88%	4	10%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	42
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	31	86%	4	11%	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	3.78	36

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	36	82%	6	14%	0	0%	1	2%	1	2%	3.70	44
Category Total	310	81%	50	13%	8	2%	9	2%	8	2%	3.68	385
3. Communication												
14. Attentiveness	54	70%	15	19%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	77
15. Deemeanor in communications with counsel	48	68%	17	24%	5	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.58	71
16. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	6	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	6
17. Relevant questions	50	65%	18	23%	7	9%	2	3%	0	0%	3.51	77
18. Preparation for oral argument	47	68%	14	20%	6	9%	2	3%	0	0%	3.54	69
Category Total	205	68%	64	21%	26	9%	5	2%	0	0%	3.56	300
4. Temperament												
19. Dignified	50	71%	16	23%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	70
21. Courteous	50	71%	17	24%	2	3%	1	1%	0	0%	3.66	70
22. Patient	49	71%	15	22%	4	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.62	69
23. Conduct that promotes confidence in the court and judge's ability	48	69%	14	20%	6	9%	1	1%	1	1%	3.53	70
Category Total	197	71%	62	22%	15	5%	4	1%	1	0%	3.61	279
5. Admin Performance												
24. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	33	42%	23	29%	13	17%	6	8%	3	4%	2.99	78
Category Total	33	42%	23	29%	13	17%	6	8%	3	4%	2.99	78



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. Kent Cattani

2022 Peer Judge 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	19	83%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	23	0
2. Knowledge of law	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	18	78%	5	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	23	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
Category Total	77	84%	15	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	92	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
Category Total	198	99%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.99	199	
3. Communication													
14. Attentiveness	22	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	22	0
15. Appropriate restrictions on counsel during argument	21	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	21	0
16. Relevant questions	20	91%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.91	22	0
Category Total	63	97%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.97	65	
4. Temperament													
17. Dignified	23	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	23	0
18. Courteous	22	96%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	23	0
19. Patient	23	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	23	0
20. 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
Category Total	90	98%	2	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	92	
5. Admin Performance													
21. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	11	50%	3	14%	8	36%	0	0%	0	0%	3.14	22	0
22. Prepared for proceedings	20	87%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
23. Works effectively with other judges	21	91%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	23	0
24. Works effectively with other court personnel	19	86%	2	9%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	22	0
25. Effective handling of ongoing workload	13	57%	6	26%	4	17%	0	0%	0	0%	3.39	23	0
Category Total	84	74%	15	13%	14	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	113	



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. Kent Cattani

2022 Superior Court Judge 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	79	80%	14	14%	4	4%	2	2%	0	0%	3.72	99	0
2. Knowledge of the law	81	82%	11	11%	6	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.74	99	0
3. Decisions based on law and facts	81	84%	11	11%	3	3%	2	2%	0	0%	3.76	97	0
4. Clearly written, legally supported decisions	80	82%	13	13%	4	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	97	0
Category Total	321	82%	49	12%	17	4%	5	1%	0	0%	3.75	392	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	58	84%	9	13%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	69	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	43	83%	9	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	52	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	83%	9	17%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.83	52	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	44	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	52	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	44	85%	8	15%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	52	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	43	84%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	51	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	43	84%	8	16%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	51	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	40	87%	6	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	46	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	44	86%	7	14%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	51	0
Category Total	402	84%	72	15%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	476	
3. Admin Performance													
14. Promptness in making rulings and rendering decisions	46	60%	24	31%	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	77	0
Category Total	46	60%	24	31%	7	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.51	77	