



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. James E. Marner
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2012

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 401 Returned: 110 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 125 Returned: 51 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 296 Returned: 32 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	96%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	95%
Communication	97%	99%	95%
Temperament	95%	100%	94%
Admin Performance	99%	99%	95%
Settlement Activities	94%	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. James E. Marner

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	64	59%	33	30%	7	6%	4	4%	1	1%	3.42	109	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	62	57%	31	29%	12	11%	2	2%	1	1%	3.40	108	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	60	59%	27	27%	11	11%	3	3%	0	0%	3.43	101	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	62	57%	31	29%	11	10%	4	4%	0	0%	3.40	108	0
Category Total	248	58%	122	29%	41	10%	13	3%	2	0%	3.41	426	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	72	66%	22	20%	9	8%	5	5%	1	1%	3.46	109	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	74	73%	16	16%	9	9%	2	2%	0	0%	3.60	101	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	73	72%	16	16%	10	10%	2	2%	1	1%	3.55	102	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	65	79%	7	9%	10	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	82	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	70	75%	14	15%	9	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	93	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	68	75%	13	14%	10	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	91	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	73	74%	14	14%	12	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	99	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	64	77%	7	8%	11	13%	1	1%	0	0%	3.61	83	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	69	72%	15	16%	11	11%	1	1%	0	0%	3.58	96	0
Category Total	628	73%	124	14%	91	11%	11	1%	2	0%	3.59	856	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	79	73%	18	17%	7	6%	4	4%	0	0%	3.59	108	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	65	76%	14	16%	6	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.66	86	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	79	72%	13	12%	14	13%	2	2%	1	1%	3.53	109	0
Category Total	223	74%	45	15%	27	9%	7	2%	1	0%	3.59	303	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	74	68%	18	17%	10	9%	6	6%	1	1%	3.45	109	0
18. Dignified	78	72%	18	17%	8	7%	4	4%	1	1%	3.54	109	0
19. Courteous	74	68%	22	20%	9	8%	2	2%	2	2%	3.50	109	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	80	74%	14	13%	8	7%	5	5%	1	1%	3.55	108	0
21. Patient	71	66%	17	16%	13	12%	4	4%	3	3%	3.38	108	0
Category Total	377	69%	89	16%	48	9%	21	4%	8	1%	3.48	543	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	74	69%	26	24%	7	6%	0	0%	1	1%	3.59	108	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	76	72%	22	21%	7	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.63	106	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	71	68%	24	23%	9	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	104	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	76	70%	22	20%	7	6%	3	3%	0	0%	3.58	108	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	73	68%	24	22%	9	8%	0	0%	1	1%	3.57	107	0
Category Total	370	69%	118	22%	39	7%	4	1%	2	0%	3.59	533	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	38	70%	8	15%	5	9%	3	6%	0	0%	3.50	54	0
Category Total	38	70%	8	15%	5	9%	3	6%	0	0%	3.50	54	



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. James E. Marner

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	24	75%	6	19%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.59	32	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	73%	4	13%	2	7%	2	7%	0	0%	3.53	30	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	73%	6	20%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%	3.60	30	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	21	75%	5	18%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.64	28	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	21	72%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	3.55	29	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	22	73%	5	17%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.53	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	76%	5	17%	1	3%	1	3%	0	0%	3.66	29	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	76%	6	21%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.69	29	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	23	77%	4	13%	2	7%	0	0%	1	3%	3.60	30	0
Category Total	199	75%	46	17%	9	3%	9	3%	4	1%	3.60	267	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	25	86%	3	10%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%	3.79	29	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	23	85%	2	7%	0	0%	2	7%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
Category Total	48	86%	5	9%	0	0%	3	5%	0	0%	3.75	56	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	25	83%	2	7%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.63	30	0
13. Dignified	25	81%	4	13%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.65	31	0
14. Courteous	26	81%	4	13%	0	0%	1	3%	1	3%	3.66	32	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	25	81%	3	10%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.61	31	0
16. Patient	25	81%	3	10%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.61	31	0
Category Total	126	81%	16	10%	3	2%	5	3%	5	3%	3.63	155	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	25	83%	2	7%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	3.70	30	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	22	81%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	1	4%	3.70	27	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	24	86%	1	4%	1	4%	2	7%	0	0%	3.68	28	0
Category Total	71	84%	7	8%	3	4%	3	4%	1	1%	3.69	85	



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. James E. Marner

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	49	96%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	51	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	49	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	50	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	48	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	49	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	48	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	49	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	48	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	48	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	49	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	50	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	51	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	48	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	49	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	50	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	51	0
Category Total	438	98%	10	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	448	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	49	96%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	51	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	49	96%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	3.90	51	0
12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	50	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	51	0

Category Total	148	97%	4	3%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3.95	153	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	49	96%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	51	0
14. Dignified	50	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	51	0
15. Courteous	50	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	51	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	50	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	51	0
17. Patient	49	98%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	50	0
Category Total	248	98%	6	2%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.98	254	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	45	88%	4	8%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.82	51	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	49	96%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.96	51	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	48	94%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	51	0
Category Total	142	93%	8	5%	2	1%	1	1%	0	0%	3.90	153	