



**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.

### Pima County Voters Only

**Hon. Jeffrey T. Bergin**  
Pima County Superior Court  
Bench: Civil  
Appointed: 2011

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Bergin  
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: 292 Returned: 75 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 49 Returned: 19 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 155 Returned: 25 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	99%
Communication	99%	100%	98%
Temperament	100%	100%	99%
Admin Performance	99%	100%	97%
Settlement Activities	97%	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. Jeffrey T. Bergin

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	35	52%	25	37%	7	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	67	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	32	50%	28	44%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	64	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	33	53%	22	35%	7	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	62	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	32	48%	27	40%	8	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	67	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>51%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>260</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	50	69%	18	25%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	72	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	47	73%	12	19%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	64	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	47	72%	12	18%	6	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	65	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	39	76%	9	18%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	51	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	41	75%	9	16%	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	55	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	43	75%	11	19%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	57	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	48	72%	14	21%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	67	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	41	77%	9	17%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	53	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	47	73%	11	17%	6	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	64	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>548</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	42	60%	21	30%	7	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	70	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	33	65%	14	27%	4	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	51	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	45	64%	20	29%	4	6%	1	1%	0	0%	3.56	70	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>191</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	54	75%	14	19%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	72	0
18. Dignified	54	75%	12	17%	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	72	0
19. Courteous	58	81%	9	13%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	72	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	56	78%	10	14%	6	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	72	0
21. Patient	60	83%	8	11%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.76	72	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.71</b>	<b>360</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	58%	20	28%	9	13%	1	1%	0	0%	3.43	72	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	43	61%	19	27%	9	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	71	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	42	65%	15	23%	8	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	65	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	47	65%	20	28%	5	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	72	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	40	56%	18	25%	11	15%	2	3%	0	0%	3.35	71	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>351</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	19	59%	8	25%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.41	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>32</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. Jeffrey T. Bergin

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	14	58%	9	38%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	14	67%	6	29%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	73%	5	23%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	22	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	70%	5	25%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	20	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	68%	5	26%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	19	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	67%	6	29%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	65%	6	30%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	20	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	15	71%	5	24%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>189</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	70%	4	20%	1	5%	1	5%	0	0%	3.55	20	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.68</b>	<b>44</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	20	83%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	24	0
13. Dignified	19	76%	5	20%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	25	0
14. Courteous	21	84%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.80	25	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	19	79%	4	17%	0	0%	1	4%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
16. Patient	20	80%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>123</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	71%	4	17%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	24	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	18	72%	4	16%	1	4%	2	8%	0	0%	3.52	25	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.58</b>	<b>73</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. Jeffrey T. Bergin

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	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	18	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	18	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.91</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>57</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
14. Dignified	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
15. Courteous	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
17. Patient	18	95%	1	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.95	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>93%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.93</b>	<b>95</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	89%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.89	19	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.89</b>	<b>57</b>	