



**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. Geoffrey Fish

Maricopa County Superior Court

Bench: Criminal

Appointed: 2014

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Fish MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**

28 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'

0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 360 Returned: 64 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 130 Returned: 33 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 256 Returned: 11 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	100%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	100%	100%	100%
Communication	100%	100%	100%
Temperament	100%	100%	100%
Admin Performance	100%	100%	100%
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. Geoffrey Fish

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	36	61%	19	32%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.54	59	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	37	62%	20	33%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	60	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	34	58%	22	37%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	59	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	34	57%	23	38%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>238</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	47	76%	12	19%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	62	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	45	76%	10	17%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	59	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	78%	9	16%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	55	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	42	76%	10	18%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	55	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	40	77%	9	17%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	52	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	42	75%	11	20%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	56	0
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	39	76%	9	18%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	51	0

13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	42	74%	12	21%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	57	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>498</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	41	65%	19	30%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	63	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	35	67%	14	27%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	52	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	44	70%	16	25%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	63	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.62</b>	<b>178</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	46	75%	13	21%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.72	61	0
18. Dignified	49	79%	10	16%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.74	62	0
19. Courteous	46	74%	13	21%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	62	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	44	71%	15	24%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	62	0
21. Patient	45	73%	13	21%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	62	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>74%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.70</b>	<b>309</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	43	68%	16	25%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	63	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	45	74%	13	21%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	61	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	38	70%	14	26%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	54	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	44	71%	15	24%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	62	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	44	72%	15	25%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	61	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>71%</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.66</b>	<b>301</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	37	70%	13	25%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	53	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.64</b>	<b>53</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. Geoffrey Fish

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	5	50%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	50%	5	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	10	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	5	56%	4	44%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	9	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	50%	4	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	8	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	6	60%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	10	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	4	57%	3	43%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	7	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	63%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>79</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	7	78%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	7	78%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>78%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>18</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	6	67%	1	11%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.44	9	0
13. Dignified	8	73%	2	18%	1	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	11	0
14. Courteous	8	73%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	11	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	9	82%	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	11	0
16. Patient	8	89%	0	0%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	9	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>76%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.69</b>	<b>51</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	78%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.67	9	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	9	90%	1	10%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.90	10	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	7	88%	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	8	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.78</b>	<b>27</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. Geoffrey Fish

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	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	28	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	26	90%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.86	29	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	27	87%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	90%	2	6%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.87	31	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	28	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	27	87%	3	10%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	28	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>283</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>99</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	27	84%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	32	0
14. Dignified	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0
15. Courteous	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	28	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.84	32	0
17. Patient	28	85%	4	12%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	33	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>85%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>163</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	23	70%	5	15%	5	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	33	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	29	88%	3	9%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.85	33	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	27	82%	5	15%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	33	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>80%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.73</b>	<b>99</b>	