CIVIC ENGAGEMENT BEYOND VOTING

2026 Gavel Watch

Report Card for Arizona Judges

© 2026 Civic Engagement Beyond Voting
Paid for by Civic Engagement Beyond Voting – Not authorized by any candidate.

Table of Contents

What is Gavel Watch and How to Use this Report	3
Overview of the Arizona Court System	3
Judicial Merit Selection	4
Judicial Performance Review Process	5
A Note on the Federalist Society	6
Research Methodology	7
Tips for Evaluating Elected Judges	8
Reading the Reports and Recommendations	9
Arizona Supreme Court	10
Court of Appeals Division I	11
Court of Appeals Division II	13
Coconino County Superior Court	15
Maricopa County Superior Court	15
Pima County Superior Court	24
Pinal County Superior Court	26
References	28

What Is Gavel Watch and How To Use This Report

Civic Engagement Beyond Voting created Gavel Watch as a resource for Arizona voters who want to learn more about judges on their ballot during retention elections. This encompasses judges in Maricopa, Pima, Pinal, and Coconino Counties, who are appointed under the Merit System of Judicial Appointment and Retention. The report reviews judges in the state judiciary only, not federal judges.

As a non-profit Indivisible group, CEBV is non-partisan but not neutral. We are proudly progressive and lead with these values in all parts of our work. This perspective embraces human dignity and equality, diversity, justice and fairness, and commitment to human rights. The recommendations in this report are based upon our best understanding of whether judges have acted with fairness and in alignment with these values.

CEBV volunteers research each judge and evaluate information about any political or social bias they may bring with them to the bench. The research includes a variety of publicly available sources including official biographies, current and previous judicial performance reports by the Commission on Judicial Performance Review, financial disclosure statements, applications for appointment, community reviews from public comment sites, news articles, and broad search results. We consider education, background, previous partisan work history, courtroom behaviour, media reports about key cases, sentencing history, and more when making recommendations about whether or not to retain a judge. Our recommendations to “not retain” is based on information we uncover, which we explain in our notes. Absence of information results in a “no objection” recommendation, which is not a positive endorsement but most often an absence of the negative.

This report also includes resources and tips for researching judicial candidates running for office in partisan races.

NOTE: The authors and researchers of Gavel Watch are not attorneys and have not participated in any cases as plaintiffs or defendants before the listed judges, nor are they participants in any part of the judicial system except as observers.

Overview Of the Arizona Court System

The Arizona court system has three levels. Judges in these courts are selected through a mix of partisan elections and appointments.

Level One: Limited Jurisdiction Courts. These are county and municipal level courts. Their jurisdiction - meaning what cases they are allowed to hear and decide - is limited by the type of case and geography. This may include traffic court, small claims court, city court, evictions, and others.

- Municipal Courts: City or town councils appoint city judges, except in Yuma, where municipal court judges are elected to 4-year terms. Phoenix and Tucson municipal court judges are nominated by a merit commission instead of the City Council.
- Justice Courts: Justices of the Peace are elected every 4 years in partisan races.

Level Two: General Jurisdiction Courts. These are the county trial courts, also called the Superior Courts. These courts hear cases on almost every topic, from divorces and custody cases to criminal charges and some evictions. Every county in Arizona has a Superior Court. Judges serve 4-year terms.

- Superior Court judges in Apache, Cochise, Gila, Graham, Greenlee, La Paz, Mohave, Navajo, Santa Cruz, Yavapai, and Yuma counties are elected in partisan races every 4 years.
- Superior Court judges in Coconino, Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal counties are selected according to the Merit System and subject to retention votes every 4 years.

Level Three: State Appellate Courts. These courts have jurisdiction to review the trials and decisions made by lower courts, and include Division I and Division II Appeals Courts and the Arizona State Supreme Court. Most cases must go to the Court of Appeals before they can be heard by the Supreme Court. Some cases involving elected officials and disputes between counties, and all death penalty appeals go straight to the Supreme Court. Judges serve 6-year terms.

- All Appellate Court judges are selected according to the Merit System and subject to retention votes every 6 years. Supreme Court justices are subject to statewide retention votes, while Appellate judges are subject to votes from northern (Division I) or southern (Division II) Arizona, the areas from which they were appointed.

Judicial Merit Selection

Arizona is one of 33 states and the District of Columbia that have some form of a merit process to choose judges. In Arizona this was championed back in the 1970s by none other than Sandra Day O'Connor, beginning when she was in the legislature, and continuing when she was appointed to the Maricopa County Superior Court. A constitutional amendment was submitted to the voters and was passed in 1974. Counties with populations of 250,000 and above join the Merit System, along with any counties that opt in through the initiative process. Yavapai will be the next county to hit the population benchmark, probably in the next census.

Under the Merit System, judicial candidates are screened and selected by public committees with the final appointment made by the Governor.

Once judges are selected through the Merit Selection Process, they are then subject to retention votes by the public to maintain their seats.

How does the Merit System work?
The Commissions on Judicial Appointments, also known as judicial nominating commissions, are responsible for recommending individuals to fill judicial vacancies. There is a Judicial Nomination Commission for each county's Superior Court and a separate commission for the Appeals Courts, which includes the Supreme Court. Each of the five nominating commissions has 16 members: 10 non-attorneys and five attorneys, plus the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court or a designated Supreme Court justice. Attorney members of the five commissions are nominated to the Governor by the Board of Governors of the State Bar of Arizona. All members of the commissions are appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate.

Each commission is explicitly bi-partisan, requiring members that are geographically dispersed and represent both major political parties or Independents. The commissions interview applicants and hear public testimony before voting to recommend a minimum of 3 candidates from different parties to submit to the Governor. The Governor must choose from that list and make the final appointments.

Judicial Performance Review Process

The Judicial Performance Review Commission is responsible for evaluating every judge that is up for retention and issues a report on whether the judge "Meets" or "Does Not Meet" professional standards. The Commission is composed of up to 34 members, made up of members of the public, up to 7 judges, and up to 6 attorneys. A majority of the Commission members must be residents of the counties they represent. Commission members serve 4-year terms.

The Commission reviews each judge based on the following standards:
- Knowledge of substantive law and procedure (legal ability): Decides cases based on applicable law, demonstrating competent legal analysis.
- Impartiality (Integrity): Free from personal bias. Administers justice fairly, ethically, and uniformly.
- Clarity of oral and written communication (Communication Skills): Issues prompt and understandable rulings and directions.
- Judicial Temperament and professionalism: Dignified, courteous, and patient.
- Administrative and case management skills/work ethic (settlement activities): Manages courtroom and office effectively. Issues rulings promptly and efficiently.

The Commission bases its evaluation of judges on the following types of information:
- Responses to surveys sent to Attorneys, Litigants, Witnesses, Jurors, and Peer Judges.
- Public comments
- Review of disciplinary records
- Recordings of courtroom proceedings
- Other tools as needed such as: courtroom observation, review of written opinions, and case management statistics.

After evaluating each judge, the Commission is required to vote at a public meeting on whether each judge "Meets" or "Does Not Meet" professional standards. Prior to 2024, commissioners could vote independently and present a nuanced view of judicial performance. Now, the final votes must be unanimous. The Commission then makes available a report that provides the overall score from the surveys and final vote results to the public.

A note on survey responses: The response rate for the surveys is very low, many judges receive ratings from less than 5% of the surveys sent out. Respondents rate each judge on the five standards on a 5-tier scale of Very Poor to Very Good. The composite summary score used as the basis for the Commission's evaluation is the percentage of surveys that give each judge a rating of Acceptable, Good, or Very Good, the bottom two scores of Poor and Very Poor are not included. It is ***not*** an average of all ratings given to the judge.

Additional resources:

- Arizona Commission on Judicial Conduct to learn more about judicial ethics and how the judiciary polices itself.
- Provide feedback on a judge or apply for membership on the AZ Judicial Performance Review Commission.
- For more Information Visit: https://www.azcourts.gov/jpr/About-JPR

A Note On The Federalist Society

The Gavel Watch report makes special consideration of any affiliation judges have with The Federalist Society. This is due to the Society's conservative activism and influence within the judicial system.

The Federalist Society originated in 1982 from a gathering of similarly-minded attorneys, judges, and legal experts. Antonin Scalia was one of the speakers at that first symposium, which celebrated a contrarian view of the courts' trend toward protecting the rights of minorities, protecting the environment and public health through regulation, and interpreting the US Constitution as an evolving document. A throughline, as described by Emma Green in The New Yorker, was "the simple, powerful idea that animates the conservative legal movement: that a judge's job is not to make value judgments or to speculate about the potential consequences of his or her decisions but, rather, to decide cases by looking solely at how the Constitution was understood at the time it was written. This method of interpretation, called originalism, would inevitably lead to the end of Roe."

From the outside, “originalism” appears to be a fig leaf doctrine that protects the rights of corporations to profit and that protects individual liberty — except when it doesn’t. Immaterial to this partly conservative, partly libertarian philosophy is preserving the health and safety of Americans and protecting the liberty of those who want to realize the ideals — not the antiquated words — of the American promise. In 2022, Peggy Quince and Lauren Rikleen from Lawyers Defending American Democracy wrote in Bloomberg Law, “The originalism backdrop for judges with Federalist Society roots has been working to change the social order in our country by overturning the right to an abortion, LGBTQ+ rights, affirmative action, regulation of property rights, regulation of businesses, diminishing the power of federal agencies, and elevating freedom of speech over other constitutional rights.” Full liberty, it appears, is reserved for those who adopt a consistently narrow moral and religious worldview.

The Federalist Society has a powerful model of nurturing conservative thought through affiliates in more than 100 law schools, then feeding adherents into influential jobs and the judiciary. All 6 conservative justices on the US Supreme Court are Federalist Society members or supporters, and state courts are increasingly absorbing similar believers. As early as 2007, Federalist Society leader Leonard Leo started targeting state courts and working to undermine independent judicial appointment systems like those in Missouri and Arizona. The Judicial Confirmation Network, which rebranded as the Judicial Crisis Network and is now the Concord Fund, has poured money into both state and federal judicial activism.

Intertwined in the sprawling Federalist Society network is the Alliance Defending Freedom along with a mind-boggling array of mega-donors, influencers, and others in a scheme that Rhode Island Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse likened to a covert intelligence agency operation. But as we learn more about multi-decade enterprise to take over the judiciary, we are likewise empowered to counter by holding judges accountable for their unpopular and backwards-looking decisions.

Research Methodology

The authors and researchers of Gavel Watch are not attorneys and have not participated in any cases as plaintiffs or defendants before the listed judges, nor are we participants in any part of the judicial system except as observers.

We research all the judges up for retention using the following publicly available tools: Judicial Performance Reports, The Robing Room, DM Cantor, websites for the various courts, financial statements submitted to the AZ Secretary of State, Google searching, news articles too numerous to mention, Twitter, Facebook, LinkedIn, endorsements by conservative organizations like the Arizona Free Enterprise Club, and The Federalist Society. Our evaluations and recommendations are not value-neutral. While Civic Engagement Beyond Voting is a non-partisan organization (meaning we are not aligned with any political party), we do hold a progressive set of values on governing, judicial standards, citizens’ rights, criminal justice, and rehabilitation and make our judgements with those values in mind.

We remain strongly concerned about the low number of surveys returned on which the ratings of the Judicial Performance Review are based, which make a quantitative analysis unreliable. For this reason, we do not feel that the JPR scores alone are sufficient for making retention recommendations. We dig into the details of the Judicial Performance Reports to determine areas of concern. As the composite score that Commissioners use doesn't include the lowest survey ratings, we look at the combined "Poor" and "Unacceptable" ratings and have set the threshold for expressing reservations at a combined score of these bottom two ratings of 20% or higher in two or more general categories.

Besides the JPR scores, the most important criterion we used to make recommendations is evidence of a biased or overt ideological perspective brought to judicial decisions. While we make special note of a judge's ties to The Federalist Society, they are not the only organization focused on pushing right-wing policies and approaches to jurisprudence. We also note connections to The Arizona Free Enterprise Club, a local right-wing organization dedicated to "advancing a pro-growth, limited government agenda in Arizona." They frequently challenge progressive ballot initiatives.

NOTE: We are recommending retention of all new appointees that have been on the bench for less than four years. If there are any areas of concern we note them, but believe they deserve more time to establish their record.

Explanation of Ratings:

- *Retain:* We affirmatively believe the judge is bringing a needed perspective to the bench.
- *No Objections:* No concerning affiliations or records found.
- *Reservations:* Some concerns about professional or political affiliations, bias, etc. but not enough specific information to warrant a Do Not Retain recommendation.
- *Do Not Retain:* This judge has multiple red flags based on their professional and political affiliations, behavior on the bench, decisions or actions informed by an overt bias, etc.

Tips For Evaluating Elected Judges

Gavel Watch only provides recommendations for judges that have been selected through the merit system and are facing a retention vote. This means there will be many judges on your ballot that you will have to evaluate and vote for on your own. If judges in your county are still elected through partisan elections, a good place to start your research is the list of resources mentioned in the Research Methodology section. Here are a few additional tips for researching and evaluating judicial candidates.

Justices of the Peace: While state law does not require that Justices of the Peace be lawyers, the position does require an understanding of the law and the legal system. Research candidate's educational and professional background for legal experience and knowledge.

Partisanship and political bias: Justices of the Peace and Superior Court Judges in non-Merit counties run in partisan elections in Arizona. However, judges should be able to evaluate and rule on cases free from partisanship or political bias. Research the candidate's background for political activity and association with organizations that advocate for specific political views or legal outcomes.

Reading This Report and Recommendations

The Gavel Watch report is divided into sections for each court that is subject to the Merit Selection System.

The reports on each individual judge include the following information:

- Name of the Judge
- Which governor appointed the justice and year they were appointed
- Results of any previous retention elections
- Topline summary of the most recent Judicial Performance Report (See Judicial Performance Review Process for explanations of terms)
- Recommendation: Retain, No Objections, Reservations, Do Not Retain
- Rationale for the recommendation and information we think is relevant to voters

Arizona Supreme Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
John Lopez IV	Ducey (2016)	2020 (72.7%)	26/127 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	**Do Not Retain**

Rationale:
We recommended DO NOT RETAIN in 2020, and we recommend DO NOT RETAIN now, due to consistent ideological bias in cases of both social justice and criminal justice. Justice Lopez was named to the Supreme Court in 2017 after Gov. Ducey expanded the court by two seats, a decision opposed by the court itself.

The examples are numerous, first and foremost the majority decision written by Justice Lopez in the Planned Parenthood vs. Mayes decision in April 2024. The case decided whether the 1864 territorial complete abortion ban took precedence over a 2022 15-week abortion ban passed by the state legislature. Justice Lopez's explanation pointed to the 2022 law as restrictive rather than permissive with regard to abortion, and thus decided the most restrictive law took precedence. “In light of this Opinion, physicians are now on notice that all abortions, except those necessary to save a woman’s life, are illegal … and that additional criminal and regulatory sanctions may apply to abortions performed after fifteen weeks’ gestation,” Lopez wrote. The decision, which overturned a lower court decision, was 4-2, with a spirited dissent by Justice Ann Timmer. Timmer wrote that the majority invented an ambiguity in the 15-week law where one didn’t exist. The 2024 citizens' constitutional amendment to protect abortion rights was passed with 61.6% of the vote, overriding the Supreme Court's decision.

In a 2022 unanimous decision rejecting a citizens' challenge to Gov. Ducey's flat tax, Justice Lopez wrote that Arizonans have no right to block lawmakers from cutting, or even eliminating, taxes. Despite broad powers granted by the state Constitution, Justice Lopez rejected the people's right to overrule matters regarding "the support and maintenance" of the state. The "flat tax" has resulted in billions of dollars in lost revenue, mostly from top income earners.

Also disqualifying were Justice Lopez's decisions in several cases pertaining to individual rights. In 2020, in a decision resolving 3 separate cases, he agreed that Arizona judges are free to sentence juveniles to de facto life sentences despite U.S. Supreme Court rulings that appear to prohibit that. In 2021, he joined the majority in a 4-3 decision that allows police to obtain information about people's internet activity without getting a search warrant. In 2025, Justice Lopez joined a unanimous decision stretching the permissibility of traffic stops, overruling the Appeals Court decision which noted that this was tantamount to random enforcement.

Add to this Justice Lopez's decision with the majority to overrule numerous lower court decisions in the notorious 2019 Brush & Nib case. This allowed a wedding invitation design shop to refuse services same-sex customers, thus striking down a Phoenix ordinance that protected lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender people from discrimination.

Justice Lopez was active in the Federalist Society as recently as 2024, serving on the Board of Directors of the Phoenix Lawyers Chapter. He was also endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2020.

In terms of the Judicial Performance Report (JPR), the sample size of returned questionnaires was very small (26 total). One pesky attorney (out of 5) rated the Justice merely “Satisfactory” in all categories of Legal Ability.

Court of Appeals Division I

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Michael S. Catlett	Ducey (2022)	N/A	32/187 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 97% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 97%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Our reservations are due in part to the judge's strong affiliation with the Federalist Society, including his compensation for travel to attend and speak at a Federalist Society conference as recently as 2025. Judge Catlett wrote the opinion in a 2024 case releasing over 200,000 voters' names to a conservative group, despite the risk of unofficial contact and harassment. The voters had been caught in a Motor Vehicles Division glitch that had failed to capture proof of citizenship. The case was one of many in the ongoing saga of election denialism in Arizona.When he was an attorney with the Attorney General's office in 2022, Mr. Catlett also argued in court in support of restoring the 1864 territorial abortion ban. Judge Catlett was rated “Very Poor” in Legal Ability by 10% of Attorneys, but this is based on a very small sample size.				
Anni L. Hill Foster	Ducey (2022)	N/A	33/136 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 96%	**Do Not Retain**
Rationale: Judge Foster served in various positions for the Republican Attorney General, Dept. of Public Safety, and finally the Governor from 2005 until Gov. Ducey appointed her to the Court of Appeals in 2022. Her final position, from 2017 to 2022, was as Gov. Ducey's General Counsel. On the governor's behalf, she prepared legislation and negotiated for the governor's policies, including preparing for implementation of the notorious SB1070. She Represented Governor Ducey on an amicus brief to the U.S. Supreme Court in Dobbs v. Jackson Women’s Health Organization challenging Roe v. Wade and seeking to have the issue returned to the states. She served as lead counsel in Ducey vs. Yellin, challenging the Biden administration's handling of Covid relief funds, which was resolved in favor of the government. While litigating on Gov. Ducey’s behalf, Ms. Foster helped to lay a basis for challenging deference to federal government experts (Chevron deference). Although this performance was as a partisan attorney rather than judge, the scope of her cases, in our opinion, covers so many objectionable perspectives that we feel her impartiality is compromised. Judge Foster has been active with The Federalist Society as well as the Republican National Lawyers Association.				
Randall M. Howe	Brewer (2012)	2014 (71.7%) 2020 (73.7%)	46/178 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 99% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Andrew M. Jacobs	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	43/180 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 94% Communication: 98% Temperament: 93% Administrative: 87%	**Retain**
Rationale: Approaches jurisprudence from a human rights lens.				

Court of Appeals Division I

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Daniel J. Kiley	Ducey (2022)	N/A	35/138 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 97% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 97%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2020 for Maricopa Superior Court. Judge Kiley's JPR score from Attorneys who have argued in his court is mediocre, with 25% rating him "Satisfactory" + "Poor" on Legal Ability, 21% on Integrity, 25% on Legal Skills, 25% on Temperament, and 30% on Administrative Skills. These scores are concerning for a higher court judge.				
James B. Morse	Ducey (2017)	2020 (68%)	24/104 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	**Reservations**
Rationale: In 2020, Judge Morse joined the majority in a 3-judge panel confirming a Corporation Commission rate increase after an appeal by the Sun City Homeowners Association, citing numerous other ACC rate increases as confirming its ability to endorse rate increases at will. As recently as 2022, Judge Morse participated in a Federalist Society symposium on Originalism and the Arizona Constitution. Judge Morse's 2026 JPR score is stellar but based on a very small sample. His 2025 scores were more varied, with one Superior Court judge rating him fully Unsatisfactory in Legal Ability, Integrity, Temperament, and Administrative Skills. Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2020.				
Jennifer M. Perkins	Ducey (2017)	2020 (65.9%)	36/134 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 97% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 94%	**Do Not Retain**
Rationale: Judge Perkins has been deeply involved with the Federalist Society since law school, and has been a member of the Executive Committee since 2020. She also serves on the Advisory Board for the Phoenix Lawyers Chapter of the Federalist Society. Her first job after clerking for federal judge James O. Browning was for the libertarian Institute for Justice, which was founded in 1991 with a grant from the Koch Foundation. In early 2026, she was on a Federalist Society panel discussing vaccine mandates and "the right to choose." Before her appointment to the Appellate Court, Judge Perkins served as First Asst. Solicitor General for Republican AG Brnovich. Her JPR score for Legal Ability shows 34% combined "Poor" + "Unsatisfactory" from Attorneys who have appeared in her court, which is a major red flag. Her Integrity bottom-two scores of 13% are based entirely on "basic fairness and impartiality." She received a "Poor" ranking for Legal Ability from one Superior Court Judge, which is highly unusual.				

Court of Appeals Division I

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
David Weinzweig	Ducey (2017)	2020 (62.3%)	32/145 responded Legal Ability: 93% Integrity: 93% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 97%	**Do Not Retain**
Rationale: In 2020, Gavel Watch recommended DO NOT RETAIN for Judge Weinzweig, and we see no reason to change that opinion. We wrote then, "As Asst AG, argued that midazolam should be allowed for executions, despite horrifying botched executions in Arizona & Oklahoma. In 2015, as Asst AG, defended a law denying abortions to women if doctors "knew" the decision was based on the fetus' sex or race." In 2019, Judge Weinzweig disagreed with the majority on an appellate panel overturning a Yuma County Superior Court decision denying the name change for a transgender man, saying there was no legal basis for the decision. Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2020. Judge Weinzweig received a 25% “Poor” ranking in Legal Ability from Attorneys, however the sample size was very small.				

Court of Appeals Division II

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Sean Brearcliffe	Ducey (2017)	2020 (69%)	20/94 responded Legal Ability: 88% Integrity: 93% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	**Do Not Retain**
Rationale: In 2020, Gavel Watch recommended DO NOT RETAIN for Judge Brearcliffe, and we see no reason to change that opinion. We wrote then, "Made donations to Gov Ducey campaign while a judge, and under consideration for Court of Appeals appointment. In 2015, ruled that a gay couple could not divorce because he felt they could not have married to begin with, and stated that he had no obligation to adhere to prior federal court precedent. Further, he sought to dismiss the case 'with prejudice,' which would have prevented the couple from filing again." More recently, Judge Brearcliffe donated to both Arizona and national Republican candidates (in 2020 and 2022) while on the bench. Judge Brearcliffe’s JPR scores show a highly concerning amount of “Poor” and “Unsatisfactory” rankings, including 18% in Legal Ability, 9% in Integrity, 11% in Temperament, and 13% in Administrative Skills. Even the average of his top-3 scores was only 88% in Legal Ability. The JPR Report alone would cause us to recommend “Do Not Retain,” especially for a judge on the second-highest court.				

Court of Appeals Division II

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Karl C. Eppich	Ducey (2017)	2020 (79.6%)	13/89 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	**Reservations**
Rationale: In 2020, Gavel Watch had reservations about Judge Eppich, and we see no reason to change. We wrote: "Harsh sentencing of juvenile arsonist to life in prison in 2019: stated that US Supreme Court decision barring life imprisonment except in cases of homicide, and US Constitution prohibition against cruel and unusual punishment did not apply in this case." Subsequent rulings continue to indicate an unwillingness to reconsider subsequent findings that could indicate more lenient sentencing, as well as a precedent-setting (2021) ruling that state courts have the ability to restore firearms rights to a convicted felon from another state. Our decision is mitigated by Judge Eppich's protection of the right to individual privacy against warrantless searches. Judge Eppich's JPR scores are largely positive.				
Lacey Stover Gard	Ducey (2022)	N/A	31/141 responded Legal Ability: 90% Integrity: 95% Communication: 93% Temperament: 91% Administrative: 100%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Judge Stover Gard's legal record suggests an overbroad interpretation of police rights and the death penalty. She served in Republican administrations from 2007 until her appointment as an Appeals Court Judge, representing the Arizona Attorney General and Solicitor General, and also as Chief Counsel of Capital Litigation Section, defending death sentences. Judge Stover Gard's JPR scores are spotty, with one Superior Court Judge rating her "Poor" in the Legal Ability categories of Legal Reasoning and Clearly Written Legally Supported Opinions. As usual, the sample size was very small.				
Michael F. Kelly	Ducey (2022)	N/A	15/114 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 85% Temperament: 94% Administrative: 100%	No Objections
Rationale: Although sample size is small, Judge Kelly received 38% "Very Poor" marks in Communication Skills under Oral Arguments and 17% "Very Poor" in Judicial Temperament.				
Christopher J. O'Neil	Ducey (2022)	N/A	22/102 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	No Objections

Court of Appeals Division II

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Jeffrey L. Sklar	Ducey (2022)	N/A	28/160 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	No Objections

Coconino County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Ted Reed	Elected (2018)	2022 (77%)	37/171 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 89% Communication: 94% Temperament: 91% Administrative: 93%	No Objections
Joshua C. Steinlage	Hobbs (2024)	N/A	84/343 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 94% Communication: 94% Temperament: 96% Administrative: 95%	**Retain**

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Bradley Astrowsky	Brewer (2012)	2022 (62.2%) 2018 (71.1%) 2014 (58.9%)	134/638 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 92% Communication: 95% Temperament: 92% Administrative: 95%	**Do Not Retain**
Rationale: In 2022, Gavel Watch recommended DO NOT RETAIN and we see no reason to change that decision. We wrote: "Reprimanded by Commission on Judicial Conduct in 2019, for delaying judgment in a marriage dissolution case to the extent of non-compliance with the law. In 2021 sent children of MLB player David Segui to unlicensed 'reunification camp' to be reunited with their abusive mother, severing communication with their father." Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2020. Judge Astrowsky's JPR scores include a concerning number of "Poor" and "Very Poor" scores from attorneys and litigants/witnesses who have appeared before him. Low scores are shown in every evaluation category.				
Michael C. Blair	Ducey (2016)	2022 (71.9%) 2018 (69.5%)	54/264 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 96% Communication: 99% Temperament: 95% Administrative: 98%	No Objections

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
John L. Blanchard	Ducey (2019)	2022 (64.8%)	139/930 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 95% Communication: 94% Temperament: 96% Administrative: 98%	No Objections
Mark H. Brain	Brewer (2011)	2022 (72.6%) 2018 (71.2%) 2014 (70.4%)	72/300 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 95% Communication: 98% Temperament:99% Administrative: 100%	No Objections
Robert I. Brooks	Ducey (2020)	2022 (75.3%)	153/678 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 94% Communication: 94% Temperament: 95% Administrative: 98%	No Objections
Rationale: Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2020.				
Sunita A. Cairo	Ducey (2022)	N/A	194/670 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Michelle Carson	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	85/426 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 88% Communication: 93% Temperament: 90% Administrative: 95%	**Retain**
Gregory S. Como	Ducey (2015)	2022 (72.6%) 2018 (73.2%)	133/441 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 97% Communication: 98% Temperament: 95% Administrative: 97%	**Retain**
Rationale: In February 2026, Judge Como enjoined the state from enforcing all laws superseded by the Right to Abortion constitutional amendment, writing “Each of these laws infringe on a woman’s ‘autonomous decision making’ by mandating medical procedures and disclosure of information regardless of the patient’s needs and wishes.” He also wrote, “Patients who are seeking abortion care after a fetal diagnosis often…require extra empathy, compassion, and understanding. Yet, without knowing about the diagnosis [of a fetal abnormality], abortion providers cannot reassure patients.” In July 2026, Judge Como also ruled HCR2040 ineligible for the ballot. This measure would have effectively crippled union activities in Arizona.				

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Katherine M. Cooper	Brewer (2011)	2022 (71.1%) 2018 (69.7%) 2014 (71.3%)	139/622 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 95% Communication: 95% Temperament: 95% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Max-Henri Covil	Ducey (2020)	2022 (66%)	128/782 responded Legal Ability: 89% Integrity: 92% Communication: 91% Temperament: 92% Administrative: 92%	No Objections
Kristin Culbertson	Ducey (2016)	2022 (68.1%) 2018 (67.9%)	114/398 responded Legal Ability: 91% Integrity: 94% Communication: 95% Temperament: 93% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Marvin L. Davis	Ducey (2020)	2022 (67.7%)	77/314 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 99% Communication: 96% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 98%	No Objections
Monica B. Edelstein	Ducey (2020)	2022 (64.1%)	95/413 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 96% Communication: 97% Temperament: 94% Administrative: 96%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Judge Edelstein's JPR report has notable red flags, including 8% "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Legal Ability, 6% in Integrity, 5% in Communication, 10% in Judicial Temperament, and 7% in Administrative Performance, all from attorneys who have appeared in her court. Her JPR scores in 2022 reflected 1 "Does Not Meet" judicial standards in a time when Commission votes didn't have to be unanimous.				
Geoffrey Fish	Brewer (2014)	2022 (73.4%) 2018 (67%)	70/335 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 98% Communication: 100% Temperament: 97% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Dewain Fox	Ducey (2015)	2022 (72.6%) 2018 (71.4%)	73/373 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 99% Communication: 98% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 98%	No Objections

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Jillian B. Francis	Ducey (2022)	N/A	117/783 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 88% Communication: 90% Temperament: 89% Administrative: 94%	No Objections
Marischa H. Gilla	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	160/568 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 98% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 98%	**Retain**
Jennifer Green	Brewer (2014)	2022 (78.1%) 2018 (78.1%)	103/327 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 100%	No Objections
Rationale: Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2022.				
Lauren R. Guyton	Hobbs (2024)	N/A	140/824 responded Legal Ability: 86% Integrity: 87% Communication: 84% Temperament: 86% Administrative: 91%	**Retain**
Melody Garland Harmon	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	105/443 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 99%	**Retain**
Michael J. Herrod	Brewer (2011)	2022 (73.1%) 2018 (70.6%) 2014 (70.7%)	157/1282 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 98% Communication: 98% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 100%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Note that he is married to Cathi Herrod, former president of the Center for Arizona Policy, which crusades tirelessly against abortion, sex education, same-sex marriage, and in favor of school vouchers. There is no indication that his spouse influences Judge Herrod's judicial impartiality. Endorsed by Free Enterprise Club in 2022.				

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Charlene D. Jackson	Ducey (2022)	N/A	134/690 responded Legal Ability: 93% Integrity: 82% Communication: 85% Temperament: 81% Administrative: 88%	No Objections
Rationale: Family and Juvenile courts, on which Judge Jackson has served, can lead to passionate disagreements about custody and parental rights. Judge Jackson has been the target of a campaign which reached into the AZ Legislature, as a conservative Republican representative, Rachel Keshel (R-17) responded to constituent complaints. The coverage that we have found is one-sided, and Gavel Watch is unable to make a determination with any objectivity. Judge Jackson's JPR score was middling, with 8% of Attorneys giving her a "Poor" + "Very Poor" rating in Legal Ability, 12% giving her that combined rating in Integrity, and 14% in Judicial Temperament.				
Melissa I. Julian	Ducey (2019)	2022 (68.5%)	142/1072 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 97% Communication: 95% Temperament: 96% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Rationale: Judge Julian's JPR Report shows a significant disparity between Attorney and Litigant/Witness rankings. While 2% of Attorneys ranked her "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Integrity, Litigants gave her 22%. Similarly, Litigants gave her 21% in Communication Skills and 20% in Judicial Temperament, while Attorney scores were 4% and 1% respectively. This is mitigated by the low number of Litigant/Witness respondents (10) and high number of Attorney respondents (100+).				
Amy M. Kalman	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	156/773 responded Legal Ability: 99% Integrity: 89% Communication: 93% Temperament: 86% Administrative: 93%	**Retain**
Joseph S. Kiefer	Ducey (2019)	2022 (73.6%)	71/459 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 99% Communication: 98% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Rationale: Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2022.				
Ronee Korbin Steiner	Ducey (2015)	2022 (71.3%) 2018 (69.8%)	91/397 responded Legal Ability: 99% Integrity: 94% Communication: 98% Temperament: 94% Administrative: 98%	No Objections

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Joseph C. Kreamer	Napolitano (2007)	2022 (72.6%) 2018 (72.6%) 2014 (68%) 2010 (63.57%)	124/570 responded Legal Ability: 99% Integrity: 98% Communication: 98% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 99%	Retain
Rationale: In August 2026, Judge Kreamer threw out the legislative referral Prop. 145, which was a devious attempt to invalidate the Protect Education Act (Prop 212) and prevent any future ESA voucher reform. His judgment identified that the measure violated the Arizona Constitution's single-subject rule. "The Court agrees with Plaintiffs that the 'no-severance clause' contained in Subsection B is unlike any severability provision that has ever been enacted in Arizona, because instead of applying only to the bill being proposed, it would apply to invalidate future legislation," Judge Kreamer wrote.				
Kerstin G. LeMaire	Ducey (2015)	2022 (67.5%) 2018 (70.8%)	134/541 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Daniel G. Martin	Napolitano (2007)	2022 (72.7%) 2018 (72.6%) 2014 (67.5%) 2010 (64%)	83/319 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 99% Communication: 100% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Julie A. Mata	Brewer (2013)	2022 (75.8%)	148/690 responded Legal Ability: 90% Integrity: 77% Communication: 82% Temperament: 78% Administrative: 87%	Do Not Retain
Rationale: In July 2026, Judge Mata ruled that Prop 142 passed muster to appear on AZ ballots. If passed in Nov 2026, this would embed bigotry in the AZ Constitution by refusing to acknowledge any human differences. In Aug 2026, Judge Mata ruled that the ballot description for Prop 212, as written by the AG and SoS offices, must by rewritten by removing the word "vouchers" and adding mentions of why the Protect Education/ Accountability Now committee has standing, and that the proposition would result in government control of private schools and homeschools. Judge Mata's JPR score shows numerous red flags, with a Legal Ability score in the lowest brackets ("Poor" plus "Very Poor") of 13% from Attorneys. Her Integrity score in the lowest brackets is 12% from Attorneys and an eye-popping 29% from Litigants/Witnesses. The total of her lowest scores in Communication (16% from Attorneys and 15% from Litigants/Witnesses), Judicial Temperament (14% from Attorneys and 35% from Litigants/Witnesses), and Administrative Skills (10% from Attorneys and 19% from Litigants/Witnesses) are similarly disturbing.				
Steven W. McCarthy	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	190/800 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 92% Communication: 93% Temperament: 94% Administrative: 96%	Retain

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Frank W. Moskowitz.	Ducey (2015)	2022 (70.9%) 2018 (72.6%)	162/1141 responded Legal Ability: 97% Integrity: 97% Communication: 95% Temperament: 95% Administrative: 96%	No Objections
Rationale: Litigants/Witnesses rated Judge Moskowitz 20% “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Integrity, 15% in Communication, and 17% in Judicial Temperament. Judge Moskowitz serves on the Civil Court.				
Samuel J. Myers	Napolitano (2007)	2022 (69.9%) 2018 (72.2%) 2014 (68.3%) 2010 (63.39%)	108/568 responded Legal Ability: 99% Integrity: 98% Communication: 98% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 100%	**Reservations**
Rationale: In May 2025, Judge Myers sent the AG Mayes' "fake electors" back to the grand jury, effectively killing the case. The judge agreed with the defendants that the state had neglected to provide the jury with a copy of a 138-year-old statute which provided a framework for disputed slates of electors. The Supreme Court refused to review the decision. Judge Myers had inherited the case the previous year, and had immediately thrown a curveball by asking AG Mayes to prove that she wasn't making a political attack on the electors who were just exercising their free speech rights (a violation of so-called Anti-SLAPP laws). Mayes replied, 'It is not the lawful exercise of free speech to file forged slates of electors to deprive Arizona voters of their right to vote.'"				
Suzanne M. Nicholls	Ducey (2020)	2022 (70.6%)	127/768 responded Legal Ability: 85% Integrity: 80% Communication: 77% Temperament: 67% Administrative: 74%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Judge Nicholls’ JPR scores are a significant cause for concern, with red flags across the board. Most importantly, 18% of her Judicial Peers rated her “Satisfactory” + “Poor” in Legal Ability and 50% in Integrity. 58% of her Judicial Peers rated her “Acceptable” + “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Communication. 43% of her Judicial Peers rated her “Acceptable” + “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Judicial Temperament. 34% of her Judicial Peers rated her “Acceptable” + “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Administrative Performance. 16% of Attorneys rated her “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Legal Ability, and 23% in Integrity. 29% of Litigants/Witnesses gave her that score in Integrity. 41% of Attorneys rated her “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Judicial Temperament. 34% of Litigants/Witnesses gave her that score in Judicial Temperament. 30% of Attorneys and 29% of Litigants/Witnesses gave her “Poor” + “Very Poor” in Administrative Performance.				
Colleen E. O'Donnell-Smith	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	125/560 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 84% Communication: 87% Temperament: 84% Administrative: 86%	**Retain**

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Jay Polk	Brewer (2013)	2022 (73.5%) 2018 (71.5%) 2014 (67.7%)	85/271 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 95% Communication: 97% Temperament:94% Administrative: 96%	No Objections
Michael Z. Rassas	Ducey (2020)	2022 (69.5%)	176/756 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 93% Communication: 90% Temperament: 85% Administrative: 93%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2022. Judge Rassas' JPR scores are concerning, although not disqualifying. Legal Ability drew a spotty score, with 4% of Attorney Reviews at "Very Poor" and 3% at "Poor." Integrity drew a bottom-2 bracket score of 9% from Litigants/Witnesses. Most concerning was Judicial Temperament, with 21% of Attorneys rating him "Poor" + "Very Poor."				
Joshua D. Rogers	Ducey (2015)	2022 (73.1%) 2018 (72.4%)	84/327 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 96% Communication: 95% Temperament: 97% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Jeffrey Rueter	Ducey (2015)	2022 (71.4%) 2018 (71.5%)	128/770 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 97% Communication: 98% Temperament: 97% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Jennifer Ryan-Touhill	Ducey (2015)	2022 (66.5%) 2018 (71.5%)	51/237 responded Legal Ability: 86% Integrity: 91% Communication: 84% Temperament: 92% Administrative: 91%	No Objections
Rationale: Judge Ryan-Touhill's JPR scores show 24% of Attorneys rating her "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Communication Skills (19% "Very Poor"). Attorneys rate her 23% "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Legal Ability and 14% in Integrity.				
Aryeh D. Schwartz	Ducey (2020)	2022 (64.9%)	109/511 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 100% Communication: 96% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 98%	No Objections

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Danielle J. Viola	Brewer (2011)	2022 (75.9%) 2018 (75.7%) 2014 (71.6%)	86/755 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 100%	No Objections
Randall H. Warner	Napolitano (2007)	2022 (69.5%) 2018 (74.3%) 2014 (68.2%) 2010 (65.35%)	221/1410 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 98% Communication: 98% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 98%	No Objections
Joseph C. Welty	Napolitani (2007)	2022 (67%) 2018 (71%) 2014 (68.3%) 2010 (63.18%)	77/159 responded Legal Ability: N/A Integrity: 97% Communication: 98% Temperament: 96% Administrative: 98/99%	No Objections
Roy Whitehead	Ducey (2015)	2022 (72.9%) 2018 (72.7%)	82/334 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Paula A. Williams	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	152/740 responded Legal Ability: 90% Integrity: 83% Communication: 84% Temperament: 72% Administrative: 87%	**Retain**
Rationale: Judge Williams is a new appointee and it's not uncommon for the first performance review to show needed improvement. Although we don't have major reservations, we note that her scores of 35% of "Poor" and "Very Poor" in Judicial Temperament, from Attorneys. She also scored 16% "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Integrity and 13% in Legal Ability, also from Attorneys.				
William R. Wingard	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	178/795 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 88% Communication: 93% Temperament: 89% Administrative: 96%	**Retain**

Maricopa County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Cassie B. Woo	Ducey (2019)	2022 (76.9%)	167/746 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 88% Communication: 93% Temperament: 87% Administrative: 96%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Endorsed by the Arizona Free Enterprise Club in 2022. With regard to the JPR Report, it's concerning that 27% of Litigants/Witnesses rated her Integrity "Poor" + "Very Poor." 23% of Litigants/Witnesses gave "Poor" + "Very Poor" rating for Judicial Temperament. These concerns are somewhat mitigated by the fact that Judge Woo is on Family Court, which is notoriously contentious and incites strong emotions on both sides. Judge Woo sat on Juvenile Court at her 2022 JPR, and her scores were notably higher.				
Melissa M. Zabor	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	155/826 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 84% Communication: 90% Temperament: 86% Administrative: 93%	**Retain**
Rationale: Judge Zabor is a new appointee and it's not uncommon for the first performance review to show needed improvement. Although we don't have major reservations, we note that her "Poor" + "Very Poor" combined rating for Legal Ability, from Attorneys, is 8% and for Integrity, from Attorneys, is 9%. Communication and Judicial Temperament, from Attorneys, are 8% and 9% respectively. Litigants/Witnesses give her a 27% "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Integrity and 22% in Communications. The low scores are mitigated by the fact that Judge Zabor is on Family Court, which is notoriously contentious and incites strong emotions on both sides.				

Pima County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Sandra Bensley	Hobbs (2024)	N/A	98/607 responded Legal Ability: 66% Integrity: 85% Communication: 81% Temperament: 85% Administrative: 81%	**Retain**
Jeffrey T. Bergin	Brewer (2011)	2022 (74.6%) 2018 (76.3%) 2014 (77.9%)	184/1182 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 99%	No Objections

Pima County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Janet C. Bostwick	Ducey (2016)	2022 (74.1%) 2018 (78.1%)	76/463 responded Legal Ability: 95% Integrity: 97% Communication: 99% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 99%	No Objections
Randi L. Burnett	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	53/343 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 92% Communication: 97% Temperament: 93% Administrative: 97%	**Retain**
J. Alan Goodwin	Ducey (2020)	2022 (73.6%)	131/560 responded Legal Ability: 99% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 100% Administrative: 100%	No Objections
Cynthia Kuhn	Ducey (2016)	2022 (72.7%), 2018 (78.8%)	156/1094 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 92% Communication: 94% Temperament: 92% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Rationale: JPR scores are somewhat concerning in terms of Attorneys' feedback, and Litigants/Witnesses gave a full 17% "Very Poor" in Integrity.				
Danelle Liwski	Brewer (2011)	2022 (75.4%) 2018 (76.4%) 2014 (74.6%)	21/176 responded Legal Ability: 88% Integrity: 95% Communication: 91% Temperament: 93% Administrative: 98%	No Objections
Rationale: Judge Liwski's JPR scores are somewhat concerning, with 13% "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Legal Ability from Attorneys. However the sample size is very small.				
Kathleen A. Quigley	Brewer (2012)	2022 (77.2%) 2018 (79.7%) 2014 (79.2%)	73/415 responded Legal Ability: 98% Integrity: 99% Communication: 97% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 98%	No Objections

Pima County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Laurie B. San Angelo	Ducey (2020)	2022 (71.8%)	61/483 responded Legal Ability: 94% Integrity: 92% Communication: 96% Temperament: 93% Administrative: 96%	No Objections
Rationale: Judge San Angelo's JPR scores are somewhat concerning, with 13% "Poor" + "Very Poor" in Integrity, from Attorneys. However the sample size is very small.				
Catherine M. Woods	Brewer (2011)	2022 (71.4%) 2018 (76.6%) 2014 (59.2%)	116/629 responded Legal Ability: 82% Integrity: 83% Communication: 87% Temperament: 85% Administrative: 89%	**Reservations**
Rationale: Judge Woods received a combined "Poor + "Very Poor" rating of 20% from Attorneys for her Legal Ability, which is quite concerning. Integrity = 16%, Communication = 17%, Temperament = 17%. Her bottom-two low scores from Litigants/Witnesses was 19%.				

Pinal County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Jessica K. Dixon	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	143/720 responded Legal Ability: 99% Integrity: 84% Communication: 93% Temperament: 88% Administrative: 94%	**Retain**
Steven J. Fuller	Elected (2010)	2022 (73.4%) 2018 (72.4%) 2014 (75.7%)	80/238 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 97% Communication: 98% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 99%	**Reservations**
Rationale: In 2022 we noted that in 2028 Judge Fuller "was credibly accused of sexual abuse of a juvenile, although he was never charged and denied the accusations. That year, Fuller received 4 'does not meet' judicial performance standards, the most of any Arizona judge in 2018. Although he received the full "meets" standards in 2022, we do not feel the credible accusation should be disregarded." Those cautions are still valid, and our recommendation remains the same. Although Judge Fuller's JPR rating had some concerns, it was based on too small a sample size to evaluate.				

Pinal County Superior Court

Judge Name	Appointed	Retained	Judicial Performance Reports	Recommendation
Danielle Harris	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	61/224 responded Legal Ability: 96% Integrity: 98% Communication: 95% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 98%	**Retain**
Delia R. Neal	Ducey (2016)	2022 (77.6%) 2018 (79.715)	74/213 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 99% Communication: 99% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 97%	No Objections
Karen F. Palmer	Hobbs (2023)	N/A	74/462 responded Legal Ability: 100% Integrity: 100% Communication: 100% Temperament: 99% Administrative: 99%	**Retain**
Daniel A. Washburn	Elected (2010)	2022 (77.27%) 2018 (78.67%) 2014 (71.0%)	87/388 responded Legal Ability: 84% Integrity: 99% Communication: 95% Temperament: 98% Administrative: 98%	No Objections
Rationale: Judge Washburn's JPR Report has a 25% "Poor" + "Very Poor" score from Attorneys in Legal Ability, which is a concern, although the sample size is small.				

References and Sources:

- *Interpreting the Constitution* from the American Constitution Society
- *After Momentous Term, Supreme Court Cements Federalist Society Vision as Law*, by Henry Gass, Christian Science Monitor, 2024
- *How the Federalist Society Won*, by Emma Green, 2022
- *The Originalism Trap*, by Madiba K. Dennie
- *"Local Opinion: Arizona's judicial appointments are a model for nation,"* by Anni Foster, Arizona Daily Star, 2019
- *We Don't Talk About Leonard*, by Andy Kroll, Andrea Bernstein and Ilya Marritz, ProPublica/On The Media, 2023
- *Federalist Society's Influence on Courts if Bad for Democracy*, by Peggy Quince & Lauren Rikleen, Bloomberg Law, 2022
- *Conquerors of the Courts*, by David Montgomery, Washington Post Magazine, 2019
- *The Scheme*, by Sheldon Whitehouse, speeches (many)

- Arizona Judicial Elections (Ballotpedia)
- Guide to Arizona Courts: Upholding Judicial Standards
- Judicial Nominating Commission

CIVIC ENGAGEMENT BEYOND VOTING

© 2026 Civic Engagement Beyond Voting
Paid for by Civic Engagement Beyond Voting – Not authorized by any candidate.