



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. Max-Henri Covil
Maricopa County Superior Court
Bench: Family
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 275 Returned: 53 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 647 Returned: 94 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	88%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	92%	n/a	88%
Communication	83%	n/a	83%
Temperament	86%	n/a	84%
Admin Performance	88%	n/a	87%
Settlement Activities	93%	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. Max-Henri Covil

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	15	34%	14	32%	10	23%	4	9%	1	2%	2.86	44	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	13	33%	12	30%	10	25%	3	8%	2	5%	2.78	40	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	15	42%	12	33%	6	17%	1	3%	2	6%	3.03	36	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	15	36%	14	33%	7	17%	4	10%	2	5%	2.86	42	0
Category Total	58	36%	52	32%	33	20%	12	7%	7	4%	2.88	162	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	21	46%	11	24%	9	20%	3	7%	2	4%	3.00	46	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	18	58%	8	26%	4	13%	1	3%	0	0%	3.39	31	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	20	53%	9	24%	5	13%	2	5%	2	5%	3.13	38	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	60%	5	25%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.40	20	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	57%	7	30%	2	9%	1	4%	0	0%	3.39	23	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	62%	5	24%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.43	21	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	15	60%	6	24%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.36	25	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	57%	6	29%	2	10%	1	5%	0	0%	3.38	21	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	17	55%	7	23%	3	10%	3	10%	1	3%	3.16	31	0
Category Total	141	55%	64	25%	31	12%	15	6%	5	2%	3.25	256	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	21	43%	15	31%	5	10%	5	10%	3	6%	2.94	49	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	16	40%	12	30%	3	8%	6	15%	3	8%	2.80	40	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	24	50%	12	25%	6	13%	5	10%	1	2%	3.10	48	0
Category Total	61	45%	39	28%	14	10%	16	12%	7	5%	2.96	137	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	23	50%	14	30%	3	7%	4	9%	2	4%	3.13	46	0
18. Dignified	25	51%	11	22%	5	10%	5	10%	3	6%	3.02	49	0
19. Courteous	26	53%	13	27%	4	8%	4	8%	2	4%	3.16	49	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	25	52%	10	21%	4	8%	5	10%	4	8%	2.98	48	0
21. Patient	26	54%	11	23%	7	15%	2	4%	2	4%	3.19	48	0
Category Total	125	52%	59	25%	23	10%	20	8%	13	5%	3.10	240	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	22	46%	15	31%	8	17%	2	4%	1	2%	3.15	48	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	25	53%	14	30%	6	13%	1	2%	1	2%	3.30	47	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	18	43%	11	26%	4	10%	2	5%	7	17%	2.74	42	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	23	48%	9	19%	8	17%	6	13%	2	4%	2.94	48	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	22	48%	8	17%	10	22%	2	4%	4	9%	2.91	46	0
Category Total	110	48%	57	25%	36	16%	13	6%	15	6%	3.01	231	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	52%	6	21%	6	21%	1	3%	1	3%	3.14	29	0
Category Total	15	52%	6	21%	6	21%	1	3%	1	3%	3.14	29	



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. Max-Henri Covil

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	41	50%	15	18%	6	7%	14	17%	6	7%	2.87	82	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	47	61%	12	16%	11	14%	4	5%	3	4%	3.25	77	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	49	60%	10	12%	8	10%	8	10%	6	7%	3.09	81	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	46	65%	10	14%	9	13%	5	7%	1	1%	3.34	71	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	47	64%	11	15%	10	14%	3	4%	2	3%	3.34	73	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	43	67%	8	13%	10	16%	1	2%	2	3%	3.39	64	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	51	69%	10	14%	10	14%	1	1%	2	3%	3.45	74	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	43	65%	8	12%	8	12%	6	9%	1	2%	3.30	66	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	46	61%	9	12%	8	11%	4	5%	8	11%	3.08	75	0
Category Total	413	62%	93	14%	80	12%	46	7%	31	5%	3.22	663	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	40	53%	14	18%	12	16%	8	11%	2	3%	3.08	76	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	31	48%	10	15%	10	15%	9	14%	5	8%	2.82	65	0
Category Total	71	50%	24	17%	22	16%	17	12%	7	5%	2.96	141	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	42	55%	10	13%	9	12%	10	13%	6	8%	2.94	77	0
13. Dignified	40	55%	13	18%	12	16%	5	7%	3	4%	3.12	73	0
14. Courteous	42	55%	15	20%	9	12%	7	9%	3	4%	3.13	76	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	40	56%	10	14%	9	13%	8	11%	5	7%	3.00	72	0
16. Patient	42	56%	10	13%	10	13%	7	9%	6	8%	3.00	75	0
Category Total	206	55%	58	16%	49	13%	37	10%	23	6%	3.04	373	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	42	57%	13	18%	10	14%	6	8%	3	4%	3.15	74	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	41	58%	11	15%	12	17%	6	8%	1	1%	3.20	71	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	43	60%	11	15%	6	8%	6	8%	6	8%	3.10	72	0
Category Total	126	58%	35	16%	28	13%	18	8%	10	5%	3.15	217	