

Hon. Judge Lewis  
 Appointment date: 2/26/2021  
 Bench assignment: Family Law

2024 Judicial Performance Review  
 Attorney Survey Responses

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>1. Legal Ability</b>														
1. Legal reasoning ability	15	63%	5	21%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	3.38	24	1	96%
2. Knowledge of substantive law	16	67%	5	21%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.46	24	1	96%
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	13	57%	7	30%	2	9%	0	0%	1	4%	3.35	23	2	96%
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	18	75%	4	17%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.58	24	1	96%
Category Total	62	65%	21	22%	8	8%	0	0%	4	4%	3.44	95		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>2. Integrity</b>														
5. Basic fairness and impartiality	16	67%	4	17%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	3.42	24	1	96%
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	13	76%	3	18%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.59	17	8	94%
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	15	68%	4	18%	2	9%	0	0%	1	5%	3.45	22	3	95%
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	12	80%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	3.60	15	10	93%
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	13	81%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	6%	3.63	16	9	94%
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	12	80%	2	13%	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	3.60	15	10	93%
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	14	74%	2	11%	2	11%	0	0%	1	5%	3.47	19	6	95%
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	12	75%	2	13%	1	6%	0	0%	1	6%	3.50	16	9	94%
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	14	70%	4	20%	1	5%	0	0%	1	5%	3.50	20	5	95%
Category Total	121	74%	25	15%	9	5%	0	0%	9	5%	3.52	164		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>3. Communication</b>														
14. Clear and logical oral communications and directions	13	54%	7	29%	2	8%	0	0%	2	8%	3.21	24	1	92%
15. Clear and logical written decisions	13	57%	4	17%	4	17%	0	0%	2	9%	3.13	23	2	91%
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	16	67%	3	13%	3	13%	1	4%	1	4%	3.33	24	1	92%
Category Total	42	59%	14	20%	9	13%	1	1%	5	7%	3.23	71		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>4. Temperament</b>														
17. Understanding and compassion	15	65%	6	26%	1	4%	0	0%	1	4%	3.48	23	2	96%
18. Dignified	14	58%	7	29%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.33	24	1	92%
19. Courteous	19	79%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.54	24	1	92%
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	15	63%	6	25%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.38	24	1	92%
21. Patient	19	79%	1	4%	3	13%	0	0%	1	4%	3.54	24	1	96%
Category Total	82	69%	22	18%	7	6%	3	3%	5	4%	3.45	119		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>5. Admin Performance</b>														
22. Punctual in conducting proceedings	13	54%	7	29%	2	8%	1	4%	1	4%	3.25	24	1	92%
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	12	50%	9	38%	2	8%	0	0%	1	4%	3.29	24	1	96%
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	11	46%	9	38%	1	4%	1	4%	2	8%	3.08	24	1	88%
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	15	63%	6	25%	1	4%	1	4%	1	4%	3.38	24	1	92%
26. Efficient management of the calendar	11	48%	6	26%	4	17%	0	0%	2	9%	3.04	23	2	91%
Category Total	62	52%	37	31%	10	8%	3	3%	7	6%	3.21	119		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>6. Settlement Activities</b>														
27. Appropriately promoted or conducted settlement	15	71%	5	24%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	3.62	21	4	95%
Category Total	15	71%	5	24%	0	0%	1	5%	0	0%	3.62	21		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Litigant Witness Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Lewis

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>1. Integrity</b>														
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	27	35%	9	12%	5	6%	5	6%	32	41%	1.92	78	0	53%
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	33	45%	6	8%	4	5%	7	9%	24	32%	2.23	74	4	58%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	31	40%	8	10%	2	3%	9	12%	27	35%	2.09	77	1	53%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	29	43%	7	10%	3	4%	9	13%	20	29%	2.24	68	10	57%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	32	46%	4	6%	3	4%	10	14%	20	29%	2.26	69	9	57%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	28	43%	5	8%	1	2%	7	11%	24	37%	2.09	65	13	52%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	34	47%	5	7%	2	3%	2	3%	29	40%	2.18	72	6	57%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	30	45%	5	8%	2	3%	9	14%	20	30%	2.24	66	12	56%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	31	43%	5	7%	4	6%	3	4%	29	40%	2.08	72	6	56%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>35%</b>	<b>2.15</b>	<b>641</b>		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>2. Communication</b>														
10. Explained proceedings	29	38%	9	12%	5	7%	8	11%	25	33%	2.12	76	2	57%
11. Explained reasons for delays	24	33%	11	15%	3	4%	5	7%	30	41%	1.92	73	5	52%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>37%</b>	<b>2.02</b>	<b>149</b>		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>3. Temperament</b>														
12. Understanding and compassion	28	36%	10	13%	3	4%	4	5%	33	42%	1.95	78	0	53%
13. Dignified	29	37%	11	14%	3	4%	6	8%	29	37%	2.06	78	0	55%
14. Courteous	29	37%	11	14%	3	4%	7	9%	28	36%	2.08	78	0	55%
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	30	38%	10	13%	2	3%	3	4%	33	42%	2.01	78	0	54%
16. Patient	32	42%	9	12%	3	4%	4	5%	29	38%	2.14	77	1	57%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>38%</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>13%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>6%</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>389</b>		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>4. Admin Performance</b>														
17. Punctual in conducting proceedings	29	38%	11	14%	5	6%	4	5%	28	36%	2.12	77	1	58%
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	33	42%	7	9%	2	3%	8	10%	28	36%	2.12	78	0	54%
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	30	39%	8	10%	3	4%	8	10%	28	36%	2.05	77	1	53%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>4%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>2.09</b>	<b>232</b>		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Staff Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Lewis

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section I: Integrity</b>														
1. Basic fairness and impartiality	5	50%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%	0	0%	3.30	10	0	100%
2. Equal Treatment regardless of race	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	3.20	10	0	90%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	5	50%	3	30%	1	10%	1	10%	0	0%	3.20	10	0	90%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	2	100%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	4	50%	2	25%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.25	8	2	100%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	4	57%	1	14%	2	29%	0	0%	0	0%	3.29	7	3	100%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	5	56%	2	22%	2	22%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	9	1	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	3	50%	1	17%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%	3.17	6	4	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	5	56%	2	22%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	3.22	9	1	89%
Category Total	40	52%	19	25%	15	19%	3	4%	0	0%	3.25	77		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section II: Communication Skills</b>														
10. Clear and logical communications	2	20%	4	40%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	2.40	10	0	70%
Category Total	2	20%	4	40%	1	10%	2	20%	1	10%	2.40	10		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section III: Judicial Temperament</b>														
11. Understanding and compassion	3	30%	5	50%	0	0%	1	10%	1	10%	2.80	10	0	80%
12. Dignified	2	20%	2	20%	4	40%	1	10%	1	10%	2.30	10	0	80%
13. Courteous	3	30%	4	40%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	2.70	10	0	80%
14. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the Court and commissioner's ability	2	20%	3	30%	4	40%	0	0%	1	10%	2.50	10	0	90%
15. Patient	2	20%	4	40%	2	20%	0	0%	2	20%	2.40	10	0	80%
Category Total	12	24%	18	36%	11	22%	3	6%	6	12%	2.54	50		

	4 Superior		3 Very Good		2 Satisfactory		1 Poor		0 Unacceptable		Mean	Total	6 No Resp	Combined Superior/Very Good/Satisfactory
	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.	Num.	Pct.				
<b>Section IV: Administrative Performance</b>														
16. Punctual in conducting proceedings	3	30%	3	30%	4	40%	0	0%	0	0%	2.90	10	0	100%
17. Maintained proper control in the courtroom	2	20%	5	50%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	2.60	10	0	80%
18. Was prepared for proceedings	4	40%	3	30%	2	20%	0	0%	1	10%	2.90	10	0	90%
19. Respectful treatment of staff	5	50%	2	20%	1	10%	1	10%	1	10%	2.90	10	0	80%
20. Cooperation with peers	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	25%	2.25	4	6	50%
21. Efficient management of the calendar	1	10%	3	30%	2	20%	2	20%	2	20%	1.90	10	0	60%
Category Total	17	31%	16	30%	10	19%	5	9%	6	11%	2.61	54		