



**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. Gregory S. Como**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 488 Returned: 80 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 36 Returned: 13 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 606 Returned: 83 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	97%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	91%
Communication	95%	100%	92%
Temperament	96%	100%	91%
Admin Performance	97%	100%	94%
Settlement Activities	98%	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. Gregory S. Como

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	47	63%	16	21%	10	13%	2	3%	0	0%	3.44	75	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	47	64%	15	20%	8	11%	3	4%	1	1%	3.41	74	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	43	62%	16	23%	8	12%	1	1%	1	1%	3.43	69	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	47	62%	18	24%	9	12%	1	1%	1	1%	3.43	76	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>294</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	51	66%	14	18%	7	9%	5	6%	0	0%	3.44	77	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	46	72%	14	22%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	64	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	48	68%	14	20%	6	8%	2	3%	1	1%	3.49	71	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	39	75%	10	19%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	52	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	41	73%	12	21%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.66	56	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	41	80%	9	18%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	51	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	44	72%	12	20%	5	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	61	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	37	77%	10	21%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	48	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	49	72%	12	18%	3	4%	4	6%	0	0%	3.56	68	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>548</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	55	69%	16	20%	6	8%	2	3%	1	1%	3.52	80	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	46	66%	13	19%	5	7%	4	6%	2	3%	3.39	70	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	54	68%	13	16%	9	11%	2	3%	1	1%	3.48	79	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>155</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>229</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	55	71%	13	17%	7	9%	3	4%	0	0%	3.54	78	0
18. Dignified	57	72%	13	16%	6	8%	3	4%	0	0%	3.57	79	0
19. Courteous	56	71%	12	15%	9	11%	2	3%	0	0%	3.54	79	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	59	75%	10	13%	6	8%	3	4%	1	1%	3.56	79	0
21. Patient	56	72%	11	14%	7	9%	3	4%	1	1%	3.51	78	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>393</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	53	68%	17	22%	7	9%	0	0%	1	1%	3.55	78	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	55	71%	14	18%	7	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.60	77	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	53	71%	13	17%	6	8%	2	3%	1	1%	3.53	75	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	57	72%	13	16%	6	8%	2	3%	1	1%	3.56	79	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	54	69%	15	19%	7	9%	1	1%	1	1%	3.54	78	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.56</b>	<b>387</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	38	72%	13	25%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.66	53	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>72%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.66</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. Gregory S. Como

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	31	43%	21	29%	9	13%	5	7%	6	8%	2.92	72	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	35	56%	17	27%	6	10%	2	3%	3	5%	3.25	63	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	37	53%	12	17%	11	16%	5	7%	5	7%	3.01	70	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	60%	11	20%	9	16%	1	2%	1	2%	3.35	55	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	53%	15	25%	10	17%	2	3%	1	2%	3.25	60	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	30	56%	12	22%	9	17%	2	4%	1	2%	3.26	54	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	33	52%	16	25%	10	16%	4	6%	1	2%	3.19	64	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	31	55%	14	25%	8	14%	1	2%	2	4%	3.27	56	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	34	52%	13	20%	11	17%	2	3%	5	8%	3.06	65	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>296</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.16</b>	<b>559</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	35	53%	15	23%	12	18%	3	5%	1	2%	3.21	66	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	28	55%	12	24%	6	12%	3	6%	2	4%	3.20	51	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>54%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>117</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	34	50%	16	24%	9	13%	4	6%	5	7%	3.03	68	0
13. Dignified	38	54%	15	21%	12	17%	3	4%	3	4%	3.15	71	0
14. Courteous	41	59%	13	19%	12	17%	0	0%	4	6%	3.24	70	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	41	59%	13	19%	9	13%	1	1%	6	9%	3.17	70	0
16. Patient	38	56%	15	22%	10	15%	4	6%	1	1%	3.25	68	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.17</b>	<b>347</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	61%	14	20%	9	13%	2	3%	2	3%	3.33	69	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	42	61%	16	23%	7	10%	3	4%	1	1%	3.38	69	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	40	59%	13	19%	10	15%	3	4%	2	3%	3.26	68	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>206</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. Gregory S. Como

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	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>99%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.99</b>	<b>117</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>39</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	12	92%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.92	13	0
14. Dignified	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
15. Courteous	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
17. Patient	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>98%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.98</b>	<b>65</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	13	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4.00	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4.00</b>	<b>39</b>	