



**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.

### Pinal County Voters Only

**Hon. Delia R. Neal**  
Pinal County Superior Court  
Bench: Criminal  
Appointed: 2016

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

Show Surveys from Prior Years

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b> Distributed: 222 Returned: 57 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b> Distributed: 85 Returned: 59 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b> Distributed: 267 Returned: 28 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	95%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	100%	96%
Communication	94%	97%	96%
Temperament	97%	100%	95%
Admin Performance	96%	97%	99%
Settlement Activities	97%	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. Delia R. Neal

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	23	44%	18	35%	8	15%	1	2%	2	4%	3.13	52	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	22	42%	18	35%	9	17%	2	4%	1	2%	3.12	52	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	21	42%	16	32%	10	20%	2	4%	1	2%	3.08	50	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	24	48%	15	30%	9	18%	1	2%	1	2%	3.20	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>44%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.13</b>	<b>204</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	32	56%	19	33%	4	7%	0	0%	2	4%	3.39	57	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	67%	13	25%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.55	51	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	33	62%	15	28%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.49	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	30	68%	9	20%	3	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.50	44	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	70%	11	24%	2	4%	0	0%	1	2%	3.59	46	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	32	70%	10	22%	3	7%	0	0%	1	2%	3.57	46	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	68%	12	24%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.56	50	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	30	68%	10	23%	3	7%	0	0%	1	2%	3.55	44	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	33	65%	13	25%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.51	51	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.52</b>	<b>442</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	29	52%	15	27%	9	16%	1	2%	2	4%	3.21	56	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	23	56%	10	24%	5	12%	1	2%	2	5%	3.24	41	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	34	61%	12	21%	7	13%	1	2%	2	4%	3.34	56	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>153</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	34	61%	17	30%	3	5%	0	0%	2	4%	3.45	56	0
18. Dignified	33	59%	16	29%	5	9%	0	0%	2	4%	3.39	56	0
19. Courteous	35	63%	15	27%	4	7%	0	0%	2	4%	3.45	56	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	35	63%	13	23%	6	11%	0	0%	2	4%	3.41	56	0
21. Patient	35	63%	14	25%	6	11%	0	0%	1	2%	3.46	56	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>61%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>27%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.43</b>	<b>280</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	52%	20	36%	5	9%	1	2%	1	2%	3.34	56	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	30	54%	17	30%	7	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.32	56	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	24	51%	16	34%	6	13%	0	0%	1	2%	3.32	47	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	32	57%	14	25%	7	13%	2	4%	1	2%	3.32	56	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	27	52%	15	29%	7	13%	2	4%	1	2%	3.25	52	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>267</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	21	62%	7	21%	5	15%	0	0%	1	3%	3.38	34	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>62%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.38</b>	<b>34</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. Delia R. Neal

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	17	63%	6	22%	2	7%	1	4%	1	4%	3.37	27	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	16	62%	7	27%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.42	26	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	18	69%	5	19%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.50	26	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	16	70%	5	22%	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	3.61	23	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	71%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	67%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.46	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	17	65%	6	23%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.42	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	13	62%	6	29%	2	10%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	67%	5	21%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.42	24	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>23%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.48</b>	<b>221</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	17	61%	7	25%	3	11%	1	4%	0	0%	3.43	28	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	14	58%	8	33%	1	4%	1	4%	0	0%	3.46	24	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>52</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	16	64%	6	24%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.40	25	0
13. Dignified	17	65%	5	19%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.42	26	0
14. Courteous	18	67%	7	26%	0	0%	1	4%	1	4%	3.48	27	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	16	62%	7	27%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.42	26	0
16. Patient	17	65%	6	23%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.46	26	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.44</b>	<b>130</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	18	67%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	18	67%	6	22%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.56	27	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	18	64%	6	21%	3	11%	0	0%	1	4%	3.43	28	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.51</b>	<b>82</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. Delia R. Neal

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	40	70%	16	28%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	57	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	43	80%	10	19%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	54	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	43	81%	10	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.81	53	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	40	82%	9	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	49	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	39	78%	10	20%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	50	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	37	76%	11	22%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.73	49	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	40	75%	13	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.75	53	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	37	79%	10	21%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	47	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	76%	12	24%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>77%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>22%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.76</b>	<b>462</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings to the jury	50	85%	7	12%	1	2%	1	2%	0	0%	3.80	59	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	42	72%	10	17%	3	5%	3	5%	0	0%	3.57	58	0

12. Clearly explained the juror's responsibilities	50	85%	6	10%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	3.78	59	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>81%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.72</b>	<b>176</b>	
<b>3. Temperament</b>													
13. Understanding and Compassion	48	84%	6	11%	2	4%	1	2%	0	0%	3.77	57	0
14. Dignified	47	84%	8	14%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.82	56	0
15. Courteous	47	81%	10	17%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	58	0
16. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court and judge's ability	48	81%	9	15%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.78	59	0
17. Patient	48	83%	8	14%	2	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.79	58	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.79</b>	<b>288</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
18. Punctuality in conducting proceedings	30	53%	15	26%	10	18%	2	4%	0	0%	3.28	57	0
19. Maintained proper control of courtroom	47	80%	9	15%	2	3%	1	2%	0	0%	3.73	59	0
20. Was prepared for the proceedings	44	76%	8	14%	4	7%	1	2%	1	2%	3.60	58	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>174</b>	