



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. Roy Chuck Whitehead
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2015

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 434 Returned: 85 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 434 Returned: 58 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	99%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	92%
Communication	99%	n/a	92%
Temperament	98%	n/a	92%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	93%
Settlement Activities	99%	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. Roy Chuck Whitehead

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	51	64%	19	24%	9	11%	0	0%	1	1%	3.49	80	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	50	63%	19	24%	10	13%	0	0%	1	1%	3.46	80	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	51	66%	17	22%	8	10%	0	0%	1	1%	3.52	77	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	51	64%	20	25%	8	10%	0	0%	1	1%	3.50	80	0
Category Total	203	64%	75	24%	35	11%	0	0%	4	1%	3.49	317	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	62	73%	15	18%	6	7%	1	1%	1	1%	3.60	85	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	66	84%	9	11%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.77	79	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	64	81%	11	14%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.75	79	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	51	82%	8	13%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	62	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	56	82%	9	13%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	68	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	55	82%	8	12%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.75	67	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	61	81%	11	15%	3	4%	0	0%	0	0%	3.77	75	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	53	83%	8	13%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	64	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	65	81%	11	14%	4	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	80	0
Category Total	533	81%	90	14%	31	5%	4	1%	1	0%	3.75	659	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	61	73%	17	20%	5	6%	0	0%	1	1%	3.63	84	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	45	71%	11	17%	6	10%	1	2%	0	0%	3.59	63	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	67	79%	11	13%	6	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.69	85	0
Category Total	173	75%	39	17%	17	7%	2	1%	1	0%	3.64	232	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	65	76%	14	16%	4	5%	1	1%	1	1%	3.66	85	0
18. Dignified	64	76%	14	17%	6	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	84	0
19. Courteous	67	79%	14	16%	3	4%	0	0%	1	1%	3.72	85	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	65	76%	13	15%	4	5%	2	2%	1	1%	3.64	85	0
21. Patient	66	79%	13	15%	4	5%	1	1%	0	0%	3.71	84	0
Category Total	327	77%	68	16%	21	5%	4	1%	3	1%	3.68	423	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	59	70%	18	21%	7	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	84	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	62	75%	14	17%	7	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.66	83	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	53	70%	15	20%	7	9%	1	1%	0	0%	3.58	76	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	62	73%	16	19%	6	7%	1	1%	0	0%	3.64	85	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	55	67%	19	23%	8	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	82	0
Category Total	291	71%	82	20%	35	9%	2	0%	0	0%	3.61	410	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	53	76%	13	19%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.69	70	0
Category Total	53	76%	13	19%	3	4%	1	1%	0	0%	3.69	70	



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. Roy Chuck Whitehead

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	42	75%	7	13%	2	4%	1	2%	4	7%	3.46	56	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	42	78%	6	11%	2	4%	2	4%	2	4%	3.56	54	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	80%	5	9%	1	2%	2	4%	3	6%	3.54	54	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	39	83%	3	6%	1	2%	2	4%	2	4%	3.60	47	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	40	83%	3	6%	1	2%	2	4%	2	4%	3.60	48	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	35	85%	3	7%	2	5%	0	0%	1	2%	3.73	41	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	42	84%	3	6%	1	2%	2	4%	2	4%	3.62	50	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	36	78%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3	7%	3.52	46	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	78%	5	10%	1	2%	1	2%	4	8%	3.47	49	0
Category Total	357	80%	40	9%	12	3%	13	3%	23	5%	3.56	445	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	42	74%	9	16%	3	5%	2	4%	1	2%	3.56	57	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	33	67%	11	22%	0	0%	1	2%	4	8%	3.39	49	0
Category Total	75	71%	20	19%	3	3%	3	3%	5	5%	3.48	106	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	40	70%	10	18%	1	2%	2	4%	4	7%	3.40	57	0	
13. Dignified	41	71%	10	17%	4	7%	2	3%	1	2%	3.52	58	0	
14. Courteous	40	69%	11	19%	2	3%	2	3%	3	5%	3.43	58	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	42	74%	9	16%	1	2%	2	4%	3	5%	3.49	57	0	
16. Patient	39	70%	10	18%	3	5%	3	5%	1	2%	3.48	56	0	
Category Total	202	71%	50	17%	11	4%	11	4%	12	4%	3.47	286		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	37	64%	16	28%	1	2%	3	5%	1	2%	3.47	58	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	42	72%	11	19%	1	2%	3	5%	1	2%	3.55	58	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	39	67%	13	22%	2	3%	0	0%	4	7%	3.43	58	0	
Category Total	118	68%	40	23%	4	2%	6	3%	6	3%	3.48	174		