



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. John L. Blanchard
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2019

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 220 Returned: 33 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 573 Returned: 95 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	91%	n/a	81%
Communication	85%	n/a	81%
Temperament	93%	n/a	81%
Admin Performance	96%	n/a	92%
Settlement Activities	90%	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. John L. Blanchard

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	12	40%	10	33%	4	13%	3	10%	1	3%	2.97	30	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	40%	9	30%	6	20%	2	7%	1	3%	2.97	30	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	11	41%	8	30%	7	26%	1	4%	0	0%	3.07	27	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	13	45%	9	31%	6	21%	0	0%	1	3%	3.14	29	0
Category Total	48	41%	36	31%	23	20%	6	5%	3	3%	3.03	116	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	16	50%	8	25%	4	13%	3	9%	1	3%	3.09	32	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	57%	4	19%	3	14%	2	10%	0	0%	3.24	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	16	53%	5	17%	5	17%	3	10%	1	3%	3.07	30	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	9	64%	2	14%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	3.36	14	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	68%	3	16%	2	11%	1	5%	0	0%	3.47	19	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	60%	3	20%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	3.33	15	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	64%	4	18%	3	14%	1	5%	0	0%	3.41	22	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	10	67%	2	13%	2	13%	1	7%	0	0%	3.40	15	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	62%	4	15%	4	15%	1	4%	1	4%	3.27	26	0
Category Total	115	59%	35	18%	27	14%	14	7%	3	2%	3.26	194	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	15	47%	7	22%	5	16%	4	13%	1	3%	2.97	32	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	14	45%	7	23%	4	13%	4	13%	2	6%	2.87	31	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	16	52%	7	23%	5	16%	1	3%	2	6%	3.10	31	0
Category Total	45	48%	21	22%	14	15%	9	10%	5	5%	2.98	94	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	16	52%	6	19%	6	19%	2	6%	1	3%	3.10	31	0
18. Dignified	17	55%	6	19%	7	23%	1	3%	0	0%	3.26	31	0
19. Courteous	18	56%	7	22%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	3.31	32	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	16	50%	6	19%	6	19%	2	6%	2	6%	3.00	32	0
21. Patient	17	55%	5	16%	7	23%	1	3%	1	3%	3.16	31	0
Category Total	84	54%	30	19%	32	20%	7	4%	4	3%	3.17	157	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	17	53%	7	22%	7	22%	0	0%	1	3%	3.22	32	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	17	53%	7	22%	7	22%	1	3%	0	0%	3.25	32	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	16	53%	5	17%	7	23%	0	0%	2	7%	3.10	30	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	53%	5	16%	8	25%	1	3%	1	3%	3.12	32	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	16	55%	6	21%	7	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	29	0
Category Total	83	54%	30	19%	36	23%	2	1%	4	3%	3.20	155	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	11	55%	5	25%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	3.20	20	0
Category Total	11	55%	5	25%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	3.20	20	



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. John L. Blanchard

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	43%	19	24%	4	5%	11	14%	12	15%	2.65	80	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	35	58%	9	15%	8	13%	5	8%	3	5%	3.13	60	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	34	44%	16	21%	2	3%	14	18%	11	14%	2.62	77	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	35	63%	9	16%	7	13%	2	4%	3	5%	3.27	56	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	35	65%	9	17%	7	13%	2	4%	1	2%	3.39	54	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	35	65%	6	11%	6	11%	3	6%	4	7%	3.20	54	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	39	61%	11	17%	6	9%	3	5%	5	8%	3.19	64	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	32	60%	7	13%	5	9%	6	11%	3	6%	3.11	53	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	38	56%	7	10%	6	9%	9	13%	8	12%	2.85	68	0
Category Total	317	56%	93	16%	51	9%	55	10%	50	9%	3.01	566	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	36	46%	15	19%	14	18%	12	15%	2	3%	2.90	79	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	28	45%	11	18%	10	16%	9	15%	4	6%	2.81	62	0
Category Total	64	45%	26	18%	24	17%	21	15%	6	4%	2.86	141	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	36	49%	9	12%	6	8%	12	16%	10	14%	2.67	73	0
13. Dignified	38	54%	11	15%	11	15%	7	10%	4	6%	3.01	71	0
14. Courteous	40	54%	12	16%	12	16%	7	9%	3	4%	3.07	74	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	37	50%	12	16%	3	4%	11	15%	11	15%	2.72	74	0
16. Patient	39	54%	15	21%	13	18%	5	7%	0	0%	3.22	72	0
Category Total	190	52%	59	16%	45	12%	42	12%	28	8%	2.94	364	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	43	57%	14	19%	14	19%	2	3%	2	3%	3.25	75	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	42	58%	12	16%	14	19%	3	4%	2	3%	3.22	73	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	41	56%	13	18%	10	14%	5	7%	4	5%	3.12	73	0
Category Total	126	57%	39	18%	38	17%	10	5%	8	4%	3.20	221	