



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Cynthia Kuhn
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2016

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	Attorney Surveys Distributed: 236 Returned: 57 Score (See Footnote)	Juror Surveys Distributed: 9 Returned: 4 Score (See Footnote)	Litigant Witness Surveys Distributed: 422 Returned: 72 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	96%	100%	92%
Communication	92%	100%	92%
Temperament	90%	100%	90%
Admin Performance	95%	100%	95%
Settlement Activities	88%	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. Cynthia Kuhn

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	17	34%	19	38%	13	26%	0	0%	1	2%	3.02	50	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	15	31%	18	37%	14	29%	1	2%	1	2%	2.92	49	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	18	43%	12	29%	10	24%	1	2%	1	2%	3.07	42	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	19	38%	14	28%	12	24%	3	6%	2	4%	2.90	50	0
Category Total	69	36%	63	33%	49	26%	5	3%	5	3%	2.97	191	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	23	44%	14	27%	11	21%	2	4%	2	4%	3.04	52	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	20	63%	7	22%	5	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	32	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	22	55%	7	18%	7	18%	0	0%	4	10%	3.08	40	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	62%	6	23%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	20	65%	5	16%	6	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	31	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	59%	5	19%	6	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.37	27	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	19	61%	5	16%	7	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.39	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	16	62%	6	23%	4	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	26	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	20	61%	4	12%	6	18%	2	6%	1	3%	3.21	33	0
Category Total	172	58%	59	20%	56	19%	4	1%	7	2%	3.29	298	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	23	44%	16	31%	10	19%	3	6%	0	0%	3.13	52	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	16	42%	10	26%	9	24%	3	8%	0	0%	3.03	38	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	27	54%	9	18%	9	18%	4	8%	1	2%	3.14	50	0
Category Total	66	47%	35	25%	28	20%	10	7%	1	1%	3.11	140	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	21	40%	12	23%	13	25%	5	10%	1	2%	2.90	52	0
18. Dignified	24	46%	14	27%	11	21%	3	6%	0	0%	3.13	52	0
19. Courteous	27	52%	9	17%	11	21%	4	8%	1	2%	3.10	52	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	27	52%	9	17%	9	17%	7	13%	0	0%	3.08	52	0
21. Patient	25	48%	8	15%	14	27%	4	8%	1	2%	3.00	52	0
Category Total	124	48%	52	20%	58	22%	23	9%	3	1%	3.04	260	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	23	46%	16	32%	10	20%	1	2%	0	0%	3.22	50	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	22	45%	13	27%	10	20%	3	6%	1	2%	3.06	49	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	48%	10	23%	11	25%	2	5%	0	0%	3.14	44	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	28	54%	10	19%	10	19%	3	6%	1	2%	3.17	52	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	22	50%	9	20%	12	27%	1	2%	0	0%	3.18	44	0
Category Total	116	49%	58	24%	53	22%	10	4%	2	1%	3.15	239	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	16	47%	6	18%	8	24%	2	6%	2	6%	2.94	34	0
Category Total	16	47%	6	18%	8	24%	2	6%	2	6%	2.94	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. Cynthia Kuhn

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	34	55%	14	23%	6	10%	3	5%	5	8%	3.11	62	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	32	60%	13	25%	4	8%	2	4%	2	4%	3.34	53	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	34	60%	13	23%	4	7%	3	5%	3	5%	3.26	57	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	33	70%	8	17%	3	6%	2	4%	1	2%	3.49	47	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	65%	9	19%	5	10%	1	2%	2	4%	3.38	48	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	29	66%	8	18%	5	11%	1	2%	1	2%	3.43	44	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	62%	13	24%	5	9%	2	4%	1	2%	3.40	55	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	29	64%	9	20%	3	7%	3	7%	1	2%	3.38	45	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	35	64%	12	22%	2	4%	1	2%	5	9%	3.29	55	0
Category Total	291	62%	99	21%	37	8%	18	4%	21	5%	3.33	466	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	39	64%	11	18%	6	10%	4	7%	1	2%	3.36	61	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	28	56%	12	24%	6	12%	1	2%	3	6%	3.22	50	0
Category Total	67	60%	23	21%	12	11%	5	5%	4	4%	3.30	111	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	36	59%	11	18%	7	11%	4	7%	3	5%	3.20	61	0
13. Dignified	37	60%	13	21%	6	10%	4	6%	2	3%	3.27	62	0
14. Courteous	37	60%	13	21%	7	11%	3	5%	2	3%	3.29	62	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	38	63%	11	18%	3	5%	4	7%	4	7%	3.25	60	0
16. Patient	37	64%	10	17%	7	12%	1	2%	3	5%	3.33	58	0
Category Total	185	61%	58	19%	30	10%	16	5%	14	5%	3.27	303	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	38	66%	9	16%	8	14%	2	3%	1	2%	3.40	58	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	38	67%	10	18%	7	12%	1	2%	1	2%	3.46	57	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	35	60%	11	19%	9	16%	2	3%	1	2%	3.33	58	0
Category Total	111	64%	30	17%	24	14%	5	3%	3	2%	3.39	173	



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. Cynthia Kuhn

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.			
1. Integrity													
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
Category Total	18	50%	18	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	36	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
Category Total	6	50%	6	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	
3. Temperament													
13. Understanding and Compassion	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
14. Dignified	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
15. Courteous	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
17. Patient	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
Category Total	10	50%	10	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	20	
4. Admin Performance													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	4	0
Category Total	6	50%	6	50%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	12	