



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. Kerstin G. LeMaire
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 340 Returned: 70 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 723 Returned: 89 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	93%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	94%	n/a	82%
Communication	91%	n/a	79%
Temperament	94%	n/a	78%
Admin Performance	94%	n/a	86%
Settlement Activities	85%	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. Kerstin G. LeMaire

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	31	48%	17	26%	11	17%	3	5%	3	5%	3.08	65	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	31	47%	17	26%	13	20%	3	5%	2	3%	3.09	66	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	32	53%	17	28%	7	12%	2	3%	2	3%	3.25	60	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	35	54%	18	28%	8	12%	1	2%	3	5%	3.25	65	0
Category Total	129	50%	69	27%	39	15%	9	4%	10	4%	3.16	256	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	42	62%	13	19%	9	13%	2	3%	2	3%	3.34	68	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	30	64%	10	21%	4	9%	2	4%	1	2%	3.40	47	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	38	61%	13	21%	6	10%	3	5%	2	3%	3.32	62	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	23	64%	7	19%	4	11%	1	3%	1	3%	3.39	36	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	26	65%	7	18%	4	10%	2	5%	1	3%	3.38	40	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	22	65%	5	15%	5	15%	1	3%	1	3%	3.35	34	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	32	68%	7	15%	5	11%	2	4%	1	2%	3.43	47	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	65%	5	15%	5	15%	1	3%	1	3%	3.35	34	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	35	66%	8	15%	7	13%	1	2%	2	4%	3.38	53	0
Category Total	270	64%	75	18%	49	12%	15	4%	12	3%	3.37	421	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	36	54%	17	25%	9	13%	3	4%	2	3%	3.22	67	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	34	54%	15	24%	8	13%	3	5%	3	5%	3.17	63	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	38	56%	15	22%	9	13%	4	6%	2	3%	3.22	68	0
Category Total	108	55%	47	24%	26	13%	10	5%	7	4%	3.21	198	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	41	61%	11	16%	10	15%	3	4%	2	3%	3.28	67	0
18. Dignified	46	68%	11	16%	8	12%	3	4%	0	0%	3.47	68	0
19. Courteous	45	66%	13	19%	7	10%	3	4%	0	0%	3.47	68	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	46	68%	10	15%	6	9%	5	7%	1	1%	3.40	68	0
21. Patient	45	66%	10	15%	9	13%	4	6%	0	0%	3.41	68	0
Category Total	223	66%	55	16%	40	12%	18	5%	3	1%	3.41	339	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	39	57%	18	26%	7	10%	4	6%	0	0%	3.35	68	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	42	62%	14	21%	7	10%	4	6%	1	1%	3.35	68	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	34	53%	12	19%	13	20%	3	5%	2	3%	3.14	64	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	40	60%	14	21%	9	13%	2	3%	2	3%	3.31	67	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	39	59%	13	20%	11	17%	2	3%	1	2%	3.32	66	0
Category Total	194	58%	71	21%	47	14%	15	5%	6	2%	3.30	333	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	18	53%	7	21%	4	12%	3	9%	2	6%	3.06	34	0
Category Total	18	53%	7	21%	4	12%	3	9%	2	6%	3.06	34	



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. Kerstin G. LeMaire

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	46	56%	11	13%	3	4%	11	13%	11	13%	2.85	82	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	41	59%	12	17%	3	4%	8	12%	5	7%	3.10	69	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	57%	11	15%	4	5%	9	12%	8	11%	2.96	75	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	39	61%	13	20%	6	9%	1	2%	5	8%	3.25	64	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	36	57%	12	19%	7	11%	3	5%	5	8%	3.13	63	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	34	59%	11	19%	4	7%	2	3%	7	12%	3.09	58	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	41	55%	15	20%	7	9%	7	9%	4	5%	3.11	74	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	36	58%	10	16%	6	10%	4	6%	6	10%	3.06	62	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	52%	14	19%	4	5%	6	8%	11	15%	2.85	73	0
Category Total	354	57%	109	18%	44	7%	51	8%	62	10%	3.04	620	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	43	52%	17	21%	5	6%	8	10%	9	11%	2.94	82	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	28	47%	15	25%	4	7%	5	8%	8	13%	2.83	60	0
Category Total	71	50%	32	23%	9	6%	13	9%	17	12%	2.89	142	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	44	54%	13	16%	3	4%	7	9%	14	17%	2.81	81	0
13. Dignified	44	54%	16	20%	7	9%	8	10%	7	9%	3.00	82	0
14. Courteous	47	58%	11	14%	8	10%	7	9%	8	10%	3.01	81	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	44	54%	15	19%	3	4%	8	10%	11	14%	2.90	81	0
16. Patient	48	59%	12	15%	3	4%	9	11%	9	11%	3.00	81	0
Category Total	227	56%	67	17%	24	6%	39	10%	49	12%	2.95	406	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	51%	18	22%	12	15%	4	5%	6	7%	3.05	82	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	43	54%	15	19%	12	15%	7	9%	3	4%	3.10	80	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	46	57%	14	17%	8	10%	8	10%	5	6%	3.09	81	0
Category Total	131	54%	47	19%	32	13%	19	8%	14	6%	3.08	243	