



**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. Suzanne M. Nicholls**  
Maricopa County Superior Court  
Bench: Family  
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	<b>Attorney Surveys</b>	<b>Juror Surveys</b>	<b>Litigant Witness Surveys</b>
	Distributed: 180 Returned: 34 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>	Distributed: 368 Returned: 79 <b>Score (See Footnote)</b>
Legal Ability	89%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	93%	n/a	90%
Communication	90%	n/a	85%
Temperament	89%	n/a	83%
Admin Performance	94%	n/a	91%
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. Suzanne M. Nicholls

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	12	39%	9	29%	6	19%	2	6%	2	6%	2.87	31	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	39%	10	32%	5	16%	2	6%	2	6%	2.90	31	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	13	48%	8	30%	4	15%	1	4%	1	4%	3.15	27	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	14	44%	10	31%	5	16%	1	3%	2	6%	3.03	32	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>31%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>2.98</b>	<b>121</b>	
<b>2. Integrity</b>													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	13	42%	10	32%	4	13%	2	6%	2	6%	2.97	31	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	12	57%	5	24%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	3.24	21	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	14	54%	8	31%	2	8%	0	0%	2	8%	3.23	26	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	8	62%	3	23%	2	15%	0	0%	0	0%	3.46	13	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	9	56%	4	25%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	3.31	16	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	9	64%	3	21%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.50	14	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	63%	5	26%	2	11%	0	0%	0	0%	3.53	19	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	8	62%	3	23%	1	8%	0	0%	1	8%	3.31	13	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	13	59%	5	23%	2	9%	0	0%	2	9%	3.23	22	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>56%</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>26%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>175</b>	
<b>3. Communication</b>													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	14	42%	12	36%	4	12%	2	6%	1	3%	3.09	33	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	12	41%	11	38%	3	10%	2	7%	1	3%	3.07	29	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	14	45%	12	39%	2	6%	0	0%	3	10%	3.10	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.09</b>	<b>93</b>	
<b>4. Temperament</b>													
17. Understanding and compassion	14	45%	10	32%	2	6%	3	10%	2	6%	3.00	31	0
18. Dignified	14	44%	13	41%	3	9%	1	3%	1	3%	3.19	32	0
19. Courteous	13	41%	12	38%	4	13%	1	3%	2	6%	3.03	32	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	13	41%	10	31%	4	13%	2	6%	3	9%	2.88	32	0
21. Patient	13	42%	10	32%	6	19%	0	0%	2	6%	3.03	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>3.03</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	16	50%	13	41%	1	3%	1	3%	1	3%	3.31	32	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	16	50%	14	44%	1	3%	0	0%	1	3%	3.38	32	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	13	42%	13	42%	2	6%	2	6%	1	3%	3.13	31	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	16	50%	12	38%	3	9%	0	0%	1	3%	3.31	32	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	13	42%	13	42%	3	10%	2	6%	0	0%	3.19	31	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>47%</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>41%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.27</b>	<b>158</b>	
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	12	60%	4	20%	2	10%	1	5%	1	5%	3.25	20	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>20</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. Suzanne M. Nicholls

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	31	48%	13	20%	10	16%	4	6%	6	9%	2.92	64	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	34	58%	12	20%	7	12%	4	7%	2	3%	3.22	59	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	32	49%	15	23%	9	14%	5	8%	4	6%	3.02	65	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	28	58%	10	21%	8	17%	1	2%	1	2%	3.31	48	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	31	58%	10	19%	8	15%	3	6%	1	2%	3.26	53	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	30	63%	8	17%	7	15%	2	4%	1	2%	3.33	48	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	33	57%	14	24%	7	12%	3	5%	1	2%	3.29	58	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	30	59%	10	20%	7	14%	3	6%	1	2%	3.27	51	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	52%	14	23%	8	13%	4	7%	3	5%	3.10	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>55%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>3.18</b>	<b>506</b>	
<b>2. Communication</b>													
10. Explained proceedings	34	52%	11	17%	11	17%	6	9%	3	5%	3.03	65	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	27	45%	11	18%	12	20%	7	12%	3	5%	2.87	60	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>49%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2.95</b>	<b>125</b>	

<b>3. Temperament</b>													
12. Understanding and compassion	29	45%	14	22%	9	14%	4	6%	8	13%	2.81	64	0
13. Dignified	32	51%	12	19%	11	17%	3	5%	5	8%	3.00	63	0
14. Courteous	36	56%	10	16%	9	14%	6	9%	3	5%	3.09	64	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	33	51%	14	22%	6	9%	3	5%	9	14%	2.91	65	0
16. Patient	31	47%	14	21%	8	12%	7	11%	6	9%	2.86	66	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>20%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>2.93</b>	<b>322</b>	
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	32	50%	14	22%	11	17%	4	6%	3	5%	3.06	64	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	36	57%	11	17%	12	19%	4	6%	0	0%	3.25	63	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	34	53%	12	19%	11	17%	5	8%	2	3%	3.11	64	0
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>18%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>7%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>3.14</b>	<b>191</b>	