



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. Michael C. Blair
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Criminal
Appointed: 2016

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 308 Returned: 56 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 399 Returned: 37 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	98%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	99%	n/a	88%
Communication	98%	n/a	88%
Temperament	99%	n/a	87%
Admin Performance	100%	n/a	91%
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. Michael C. Blair

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	32	59%	18	33%	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	3.48	54	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	31	58%	17	32%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.45	53	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	30	63%	13	27%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.48	48	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	28	54%	19	37%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.40	52	0
Category Total	121	58%	67	32%	14	7%	2	1%	3	1%	3.45	207	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	34	64%	14	26%	3	6%	2	4%	0	0%	3.51	53	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	25	66%	10	26%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	38	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	66%	12	26%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.55	47	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	24	71%	6	18%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	34	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	26	72%	7	19%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	36	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	22	69%	7	22%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	32	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	26	67%	10	26%	3	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	39	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	22	67%	8	24%	3	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	33	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	26	67%	9	23%	4	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	39	0
Category Total	236	67%	83	24%	29	8%	3	1%	0	0%	3.57	351	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	36	65%	16	29%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	55	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	31	63%	14	29%	2	4%	2	4%	0	0%	3.51	49	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	35	65%	14	26%	4	7%	1	2%	0	0%	3.54	54	0
Category Total	102	65%	44	28%	9	6%	3	2%	0	0%	3.55	158	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	36	68%	11	21%	5	9%	1	2%	0	0%	3.55	53	0
18. Dignified	37	67%	11	20%	7	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	55	0
19. Courteous	37	67%	11	20%	7	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.55	55	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	36	65%	13	24%	4	7%	2	4%	0	0%	3.51	55	0
21. Patient	36	65%	14	25%	5	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	55	0
Category Total	182	67%	60	22%	28	10%	3	1%	0	0%	3.54	273	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	38	69%	14	25%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	55	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	39	71%	13	24%	3	5%	0	0%	0	0%	3.65	55	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	36	68%	13	25%	3	6%	1	2%	0	0%	3.58	53	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	39	71%	12	22%	4	7%	0	0%	0	0%	3.64	55	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	34	65%	15	29%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.60	52	0
Category Total	186	69%	67	25%	16	6%	1	0%	0	0%	3.62	270	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	17	53%	11	34%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	32	0
Category Total	17	53%	11	34%	4	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.41	32	



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. Michael C. Blair

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	14	39%	12	33%	3	8%	4	11%	3	8%	2.83	36	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	52%	9	27%	4	12%	2	6%	1	3%	3.18	33	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	50%	8	24%	4	12%	3	9%	2	6%	3.03	34	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	17	53%	8	25%	4	13%	1	3%	2	6%	3.16	32	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	18	56%	8	25%	4	13%	1	3%	1	3%	3.28	32	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	53%	8	27%	2	7%	2	7%	2	7%	3.13	30	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	18	56%	7	22%	5	16%	1	3%	1	3%	3.25	32	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	52%	9	29%	4	13%	1	3%	1	3%	3.23	31	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	50%	7	22%	2	6%	4	13%	3	9%	2.91	32	0
Category Total	149	51%	76	26%	32	11%	19	7%	16	5%	3.11	292	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	18	49%	9	24%	5	14%	3	8%	2	5%	3.03	37	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	16	55%	3	10%	7	24%	2	7%	1	3%	3.07	29	0
Category Total	34	52%	12	18%	12	18%	5	8%	3	5%	3.05	66	

3. Temperament														
12. Understanding and compassion	20	56%	7	19%	2	6%	3	8%	4	11%	3.00	36	0	
13. Dignified	21	58%	6	17%	5	14%	2	6%	2	6%	3.17	36	0	
14. Courteous	23	62%	6	16%	5	14%	2	5%	1	3%	3.30	37	0	
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	20	57%	5	14%	4	11%	1	3%	5	14%	2.97	35	0	
16. Patient	23	64%	4	11%	5	14%	2	6%	2	6%	3.22	36	0	
Category Total	107	59%	28	16%	21	12%	10	6%	14	8%	3.13	180		
4. Admin Performance														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	19	54%	8	23%	4	11%	3	9%	1	3%	3.17	35	0	
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	21	60%	8	23%	4	11%	0	0%	2	6%	3.31	35	0	
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	21	60%	6	17%	5	14%	2	6%	1	3%	3.26	35	0	
Category Total	61	58%	22	21%	13	12%	5	5%	4	4%	3.25	105		