



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.

Pima County Voters Only

Hon. Laurie B. San Angelo
Pima County Superior Court
Bench: Juvenile
Appointed: 2020

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

2022	Attorney Surveys	Juror Surveys	Litigant Witness Surveys
	Distributed: 113 Returned: 24 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 0 Returned: 0 Score (See Footnote)	Distributed: 312 Returned: 26 Score (See Footnote)
Legal Ability	92%	n/a	n/a
Integrity	97%	n/a	100%
Communication	90%	n/a	96%
Temperament	89%	n/a	97%
Admin Performance	87%	n/a	96%
Settlement Activities	86%	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. Laurie B. San Angelo

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	7	33%	7	33%	5	24%	1	5%	1	5%	2.86	21	0
2. Knowledge of substantive law	7	33%	6	29%	7	33%	0	0%	1	5%	2.86	21	0
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	8	40%	5	25%	6	30%	0	0%	1	5%	2.95	20	0
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	8	38%	7	33%	3	14%	2	10%	1	5%	2.90	21	0
Category Total	30	36%	25	30%	21	25%	3	4%	4	5%	2.89	83	
2. Integrity													
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	11	50%	4	18%	4	18%	0	0%	3	14%	2.91	22	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	59%	3	14%	6	27%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	22	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	13	59%	4	18%	5	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	22	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	63%	3	16%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	19	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	12	60%	4	20%	4	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	20	0
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	13	65%	3	15%	4	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.45	20	0
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	13	62%	3	14%	5	24%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	21	0

12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	63%	3	16%	4	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	19	0
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	55%	4	18%	3	14%	3	14%	0	0%	3.14	22	0
Category Total	111	59%	31	17%	39	21%	3	2%	3	2%	3.30	187	
3. Communication													
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	8	36%	5	23%	7	32%	0	0%	2	9%	2.77	22	0
15. Clear and logical written decisions	9	47%	5	26%	4	21%	1	5%	0	0%	3.16	19	0
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	10	45%	5	23%	4	18%	2	9%	1	5%	2.95	22	0
Category Total	27	43%	15	24%	15	24%	3	5%	3	5%	2.95	63	
4. Temperament													
17. Understanding and compassion	10	45%	4	18%	6	27%	0	0%	2	9%	2.91	22	0
18. Dignified	11	50%	4	18%	5	23%	1	5%	1	5%	3.05	22	0
19. Courteous	11	50%	4	18%	5	23%	1	5%	1	5%	3.05	22	0
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge"s ability	10	45%	4	18%	5	23%	2	9%	1	5%	2.91	22	0
21. Patient	11	50%	4	18%	4	18%	1	5%	2	9%	2.95	22	0
Category Total	53	48%	20	18%	25	23%	5	5%	7	6%	2.97	110	
5. Admin Performance													
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	7	32%	4	18%	8	36%	0	0%	3	14%	2.55	22	0
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	9	41%	3	14%	7	32%	2	9%	1	5%	2.77	22	0
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	8	42%	2	11%	7	37%	1	5%	1	5%	2.79	19	0
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	9	41%	5	23%	6	27%	0	0%	2	9%	2.86	22	0
26. Efficient management of the calendar	8	38%	3	14%	6	29%	1	5%	3	14%	2.57	21	0
Category Total	41	39%	17	16%	34	32%	4	4%	10	9%	2.71	106	
6. Settlement Activities													
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	4	57%	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	3.00	7	0
Category Total	4	57%	0	0%	2	29%	1	14%	0	0%	3.00	7	



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. Laurie B. San Angelo

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	11	44%	10	40%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.28	25	0
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	52%	9	36%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	25	0
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	12	48%	10	40%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	25	0
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	11	46%	10	42%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	24	0
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	11	46%	10	42%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	24	0
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	11	46%	10	42%	2	8%	1	4%	0	0%	3.29	24	0
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	12	48%	10	40%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	25	0
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	11	46%	10	42%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	24	0
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	12	48%	10	40%	3	12%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	25	0
Category Total	104	47%	89	40%	27	12%	1	0%	0	0%	3.34	221	
2. Communication													
10. Explained proceedings	11	44%	9	36%	4	16%	0	0%	1	4%	3.16	25	0
11. Explained reasons for delays	12	48%	7	28%	5	20%	0	0%	1	4%	3.16	25	0
Category Total	23	46%	16	32%	9	18%	0	0%	2	4%	3.16	50	

3. Temperament													
12. Understanding and compassion	13	52%	8	32%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.28	25	0
13. Dignified	12	48%	9	36%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	25	0
14. Courteous	13	52%	9	36%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.32	25	0
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	13	52%	8	32%	3	12%	0	0%	1	4%	3.28	25	0
16. Patient	12	48%	8	32%	4	16%	1	4%	0	0%	3.24	25	0
Category Total	63	50%	42	34%	16	13%	1	1%	3	2%	3.29	125	
4. Admin Performance													
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	8	32%	12	48%	3	12%	1	4%	1	4%	3.00	25	0
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	12	48%	9	36%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.32	25	0
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	12	48%	9	36%	3	12%	1	4%	0	0%	3.28	25	0
Category Total	32	43%	30	40%	10	13%	2	3%	1	1%	3.20	75	