



**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. Melissa Iyer Julian**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2019

**100% of the Commission Voted Judge Iyer Julian  
MEETS Judicial Performance Standards**  
22 Commissioners Voted 'Meets'  
0 Commissioners Voted 'Does Not Meet'

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 213 Returned: 50 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 416 Returned: 80 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	94%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	98%	n/a	84%
Communication	95%	n/a	79%
Temperament	94%	n/a	77%
Admin Performance	98%	n/a	87%
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. Melissa Iyer Julian

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	26	57%	11	24%	5	11%	2	4%	2	4%	3.24	46	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	25	54%	12	26%	5	11%	2	4%	2	4%	3.22	46	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	27	59%	11	24%	6	13%	0	0%	2	4%	3.33	46	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	28	58%	12	25%	6	13%	0	0%	2	4%	3.33	48	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>57%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.28</b>	<b>186</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	25	51%	18	37%	3	6%	1	2%	2	4%	3.29	49	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	24	71%	9	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	34	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	62%	11	24%	4	9%	0	0%	2	4%	3.40	45	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	19	70%	8	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	70%	8	30%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.70	27	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	17	71%	7	29%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.71	24	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	22	71%	8	26%	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3.68	31	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	18	69%	8	31%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3.69	26	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	24	63%	10	26%	3	8%	0	0%	1	3%	3.47	38	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.55</b>	<b>301</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	29	58%	12	24%	7	14%	1	2%	1	2%	3.34	50	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	27	61%	10	23%	4	9%	2	5%	1	2%	3.36	44	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	28	56%	12	24%	8	16%	0	0%	2	4%	3.28	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.33</b>	<b>144</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	25	50%	14	28%	7	14%	2	4%	2	4%	3.16	50	0
18. Dignified	31	62%	14	28%	4	8%	0	0%	1	2%	3.48	50	0
19. Courteous	30	60%	10	20%	8	16%	1	2%	1	2%	3.34	50	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	32	64%	11	22%	5	10%	0	0%	2	4%	3.42	50	0
21. Patient	27	54%	10	20%	8	16%	3	6%	2	4%	3.14	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>24%</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.31</b>	<b>250</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	31	63%	15	31%	3	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	49	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	32	65%	16	33%	1	2%	0	0%	0	0%	3.63	49	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	32	67%	12	25%	3	6%	0	0%	1	2%	3.54	48	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	34	68%	11	22%	3	6%	0	0%	2	4%	3.50	50	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	34	68%	8	16%	7	14%	0	0%	1	2%	3.48	50	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>3.54</b>	<b>246</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	19	59%	9	28%	4	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.47	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>28%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3.47</b>	<b>32</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. Melissa Iyer Julian

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	35	51%	9	13%	4	6%	8	12%	13	19%	2.65	69	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	40	71%	4	7%	4	7%	4	7%	4	7%	3.29	56	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	41	59%	6	9%	4	6%	9	13%	9	13%	2.88	69	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	38	78%	3	6%	4	8%	1	2%	3	6%	3.47	49	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	41	77%	2	4%	6	11%	1	2%	3	6%	3.45	53	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	38	72%	3	6%	6	11%	0	0%	6	11%	3.26	53	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	41	75%	4	7%	6	11%	1	2%	3	5%	3.44	55	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	41	79%	2	4%	6	12%	0	0%	3	6%	3.50	52	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	39	64%	5	8%	4	7%	6	10%	7	11%	3.03	61	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>3.19</b>	<b>517</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	34	53%	10	16%	5	8%	7	11%	8	13%	2.86	64	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	31	56%	7	13%	7	13%	6	11%	4	7%	3.00	55	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.92</b>	<b>119</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	35	56%	5	8%	4	6%	7	11%	11	18%	2.74	62	0
13. Dignified	36	61%	7	12%	6	10%	2	3%	8	14%	3.03	59	0
14. Courteous	38	62%	5	8%	7	11%	4	7%	7	11%	3.03	61	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	39	64%	3	5%	2	3%	7	11%	10	16%	2.89	61	0
16. Patient	36	58%	7	11%	4	6%	6	10%	9	15%	2.89	62	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>305</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	37	60%	8	13%	10	16%	3	5%	4	6%	3.15	62	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	40	67%	4	7%	10	17%	5	8%	1	2%	3.28	60	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	40	68%	4	7%	5	8%	6	10%	4	7%	3.19	59	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>65%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>181</b>	