



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. Marvin L. Davis
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 175 Returned: 40 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 366 Returned: 56 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	94%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	96%	n/a	85%
Communication	92%	n/a	71%
Temperament	95%	n/a	80%
Admin Performance	95%	n/a	88%
Settlement Activities	91%	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. Marvin L. Davis

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	47%	8	22%	9	25%	0	0%	2	6%	3.06	36	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	17	47%	9	25%	6	17%	2	6%	2	6%	3.03	36	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	18	58%	5	16%	7	23%	1	3%	0	0%	3.29	31	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	17	47%	10	28%	8	22%	1	3%	0	0%	3.19	36	0
Category Total	69	50%	32	23%	30	22%	4	3%	4	3%	3.14	139	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	22	56%	5	13%	9	23%	2	5%	1	3%	3.15	39	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	21	68%	3	10%	6	19%	1	3%	0	0%	3.42	31	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	56%	6	17%	7	19%	3	8%	0	0%	3.19	36	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	15	71%	1	5%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.48	21	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	17	71%	2	8%	5	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	24	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	14	70%	1	5%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	20	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	18	72%	2	8%	5	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	25	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	70%	1	5%	5	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	20	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	19	63%	4	13%	5	17%	2	7%	0	0%	3.33	30	0
Category Total	160	65%	25	10%	52	21%	8	3%	1	0%	3.36	246	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	20	50%	10	25%	7	18%	2	5%	1	3%	3.15	40	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	19	54%	5	14%	8	23%	1	3%	2	6%	3.09	35	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	20	51%	9	23%	7	18%	3	8%	0	0%	3.18	39	0
Category Total	59	52%	24	21%	22	19%	6	5%	3	3%	3.14	114	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	62%	6	16%	5	14%	2	5%	1	3%	3.30	37	0
18. Dignified	24	60%	7	18%	8	20%	1	3%	0	0%	3.35	40	0
19. Courteous	24	60%	9	23%	5	13%	2	5%	0	0%	3.38	40	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	24	60%	7	18%	6	15%	1	3%	2	5%	3.25	40	0
21. Patient	24	62%	8	21%	6	15%	1	3%	0	0%	3.41	39	0
Category Total	119	61%	37	19%	30	15%	7	4%	3	2%	3.34	196	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	20	51%	10	26%	8	21%	1	3%	0	0%	3.26	39	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	22	56%	9	23%	7	18%	1	3%	0	0%	3.33	39	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	21	57%	10	27%	3	8%	0	0%	3	8%	3.24	37	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	61%	7	18%	7	18%	0	0%	1	3%	3.34	38	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	17	47%	7	19%	9	25%	2	6%	1	3%	3.03	36	0
Category Total	103	54%	43	23%	34	18%	4	2%	5	3%	3.24	189	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	11	48%	5	22%	5	22%	1	4%	1	4%	3.04	23	0
Category Total	11	48%	5	22%	5	22%	1	4%	1	4%	3.04	23	



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. Marvin L. Davis

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	23	47%	9	18%	4	8%	7	14%	6	12%	2.73	49	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	26	57%	9	20%	3	7%	3	7%	5	11%	3.04	46	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	28	61%	5	11%	2	4%	5	11%	6	13%	2.96	46	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	25	66%	6	16%	4	11%	0	0%	3	8%	3.32	38	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	26	65%	7	18%	4	10%	1	3%	2	5%	3.35	40	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	25	66%	4	11%	5	13%	0	0%	4	11%	3.21	38	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	27	68%	7	18%	3	8%	2	5%	1	3%	3.42	40	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	27	71%	4	11%	2	5%	1	3%	4	11%	3.29	38	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	27	60%	6	13%	5	11%	4	9%	3	7%	3.11	45	0
Category Total	234	62%	57	15%	32	8%	23	6%	34	9%	3.14	380	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	24	47%	9	18%	5	10%	8	16%	5	10%	2.76	51	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	18	45%	6	15%	3	8%	5	13%	8	20%	2.52	40	0
Category Total	42	46%	15	16%	8	9%	13	14%	13	14%	2.66	91	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	23	48%	8	17%	5	10%	4	8%	8	17%	2.71	48	0
13. Dignified	24	55%	8	18%	4	9%	2	5%	6	14%	2.95	44	0
14. Courteous	29	62%	5	11%	6	13%	3	6%	4	9%	3.11	47	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	26	58%	6	13%	1	2%	5	11%	7	16%	2.87	45	0
16. Patient	29	62%	6	13%	5	11%	3	6%	4	9%	3.13	47	0
Category Total	131	57%	33	14%	21	9%	17	7%	29	13%	2.95	231	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	58%	8	16%	9	18%	3	6%	1	2%	3.22	50	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	28	57%	8	16%	9	18%	2	4%	2	4%	3.18	49	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	25	51%	8	16%	6	12%	6	12%	4	8%	2.90	49	0
Category Total	82	55%	24	16%	24	16%	11	7%	7	5%	3.10	148	