



**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. Howard D. Sukenic**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2015

**59% of the Commission Voted Judge Sukenic MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**  
13 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
9 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 431 Returned: 71 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 17 Returned: 17 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 274 Returned: 21 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	89%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	93%	100%	86%
Communication	86%	100%	78%
Temperament	75%	100%	74%
Admin Performance	96%	100%	89%
Settlement Activities	83%	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. Howard D. Sukenic

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	21	33%	22	34%	13	20%	7	11%	1	2%	2.86	64	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	21	33%	24	38%	12	19%	6	9%	1	2%	2.91	64	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	20	35%	22	39%	10	18%	3	5%	2	4%	2.96	57	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	21	34%	23	38%	10	16%	5	8%	2	3%	2.92	61	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>246</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	20	30%	19	28%	12	18%	6	9%	10	15%	2.49	67	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	45%	16	34%	8	17%	1	2%	1	2%	3.17	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	24	45%	17	32%	8	15%	2	4%	2	4%	3.11	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	18	45%	13	33%	8	20%	1	3%	0	0%	3.20	40	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	49%	13	32%	7	17%	1	2%	0	0%	3.27	41	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	18	46%	14	36%	7	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.28	39	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	48%	14	30%	9	20%	0	0%	1	2%	3.22	46	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	18	47%	13	34%	7	18%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	38	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	22	45%	16	33%	8	16%	2	4%	1	2%	3.14	49	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>183</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>420</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	22	33%	20	30%	14	21%	4	6%	6	9%	2.73	66	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	19	33%	22	39%	9	16%	2	4%	5	9%	2.84	57	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	23	35%	21	32%	12	18%	4	6%	6	9%	2.77	66	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>189</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	13	20%	18	27%	16	24%	7	11%	12	18%	2.20	66	0
18. Dignified	17	25%	20	29%	16	24%	7	10%	8	12%	2.46	68	0
19. Courteous	14	21%	19	28%	18	26%	9	13%	8	12%	2.32	68	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	17	25%	22	33%	12	18%	7	10%	9	13%	2.46	67	0
21. Patient	12	18%	15	22%	22	33%	11	16%	7	10%	2.21	67	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>2.33</b>	<b>336</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	26	40%	19	29%	17	26%	2	3%	1	2%	3.03	65	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	26	39%	20	30%	18	27%	2	3%	1	1%	3.01	67	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	41%	20	34%	13	22%	1	2%	0	0%	3.16	58	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	38%	22	33%	16	24%	1	2%	2	3%	3.02	66	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	26	41%	22	35%	11	17%	3	5%	1	2%	3.10	63	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>32%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.06</b>	<b>319</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	10	29%	12	34%	7	20%	2	6%	4	11%	2.63	35	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>34%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2.63</b>	<b>35</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. Howard D. Sukenic

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	9	45%	3	15%	2	10%	4	20%	2	10%	2.65	20	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	8	67%	2	17%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.33	12	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	9	53%	2	12%	2	12%	2	12%	2	12%	2.82	17	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	7	58%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	3.17	12	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	6	55%	3	27%	1	9%	0	0%	1	9%	3.18	11	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	6	60%	2	20%	1	10%	0	0%	1	10%	3.20	10	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	7	58%	2	17%	2	17%	0	0%	1	8%	3.17	12	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	5	50%	2	20%	3	30%	0	0%	0	0%	3.20	10	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	38%	3	23%	4	31%	0	0%	1	8%	2.85	13	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>117</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	10	48%	1	5%	6	29%	4	19%	0	0%	2.81	21	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	8	53%	0	0%	3	20%	4	27%	0	0%	2.80	15	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2.81</b>	<b>36</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	10	53%	2	11%	1	5%	2	11%	4	21%	2.63	19	0
13. Dignified	10	56%	2	11%	2	11%	1	6%	3	17%	2.83	18	0
14. Courteous	9	50%	2	11%	2	11%	3	17%	2	11%	2.72	18	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	10	56%	2	11%	1	6%	2	11%	3	17%	2.78	18	0
16. Patient	10	50%	1	5%	5	25%	1	5%	3	15%	2.70	20	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>2.73</b>	<b>93</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	10	50%	4	20%	5	25%	1	5%	0	0%	3.15	20	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	10	48%	3	14%	7	33%	0	0%	1	5%	3.00	21	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	11	52%	1	5%	4	19%	4	19%	1	5%	2.81	21	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>62</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. Howard D. Sukenic

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	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	82%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	17	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.82</b>	<b>153</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	14	88%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	16	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	93%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.93	15	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	15	94%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.94	16	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>91%</b>	<b>4</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>47</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
14. Dignified	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
15. Courteous	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
17. Patient	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.88</b>	<b>85</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	13	76%	4	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	88%	2	12%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.88	17	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>16%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.84</b>	<b>51</b>	