

Hon. Judge Rosales  
 Appointment date: 3/1/2015  
 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	13	48%	8	30%	4	15%	2	7%	0	0%	3.19	27	0	93%
2. Knowledge of substantive law	12	44%	7	26%	5	19%	3	11%	0	0%	3.04	27	0	89%
3. Knowledge of rules of evidence	12	46%	8	31%	4	15%	2	8%	0	0%	3.15	26	1	92%
4. Knowledge of rules of procedure	12	44%	8	30%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	3.11	27	0	93%
Category Total	49	46%	31	29%	18	17%	9	8%	0	0%	3.12	107		

	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	17	63%	3	11%	5	19%	2	7%	0	0%	3.30	27	0	93%
6. Equal treatment regardless of race	17	71%	3	13%	3	13%	1	4%	0	0%	3.50	24	3	96%
7. Equal treatment regardless of gender	17	68%	4	16%	4	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.52	25	2	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of religion	14	74%	2	11%	3	16%	0	0%	0	0%	3.58	19	8	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	16	76%	2	10%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	6	100%
10. Equal treatment regardless of disability	16	76%	2	10%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.62	21	6	100%
11. Equal treatment regardless of age	16	73%	3	14%	3	14%	0	0%	0	0%	3.59	22	5	100%
12. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	14	82%	2	12%	1	6%	0	0%	0	0%	3.76	17	10	100%
13. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	16	70%	4	17%	3	13%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	23	4	100%
Category Total	143	72%	25	13%	28	14%	3	2%	0	0%	3.55	199		

	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	16	59%	4	15%	7	26%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	27	0	100%
15. Clear and logical written decisions	12	44%	9	33%	4	15%	2	7%	0	0%	3.15	27	0	93%
16. Gave all parties an adequate opportunity to be heard	17	63%	4	15%	3	11%	2	7%	1	4%	3.26	27	0	89%
Category Total	45	56%	17	21%	14	17%	4	5%	1	1%	3.25	81		

	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	16	59%	5	19%	5	19%	1	4%	0	0%	3.33	27	0	96%
18. Dignified	14	52%	8	30%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.30	27	0	96%
19. Courteous	16	59%	6	22%	3	11%	2	7%	0	0%	3.33	27	0	93%
20. Conduct that promoted public confidence in the court and judge's ability	17	63%	4	15%	3	11%	3	11%	0	0%	3.30	27	0	89%
21. Patient	17	63%	3	11%	5	19%	1	4%	1	4%	3.26	27	0	93%
Category Total	80	59%	26	19%	20	15%	8	6%	1	1%	3.30	135		

	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	12	44%	10	37%	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	3.26	27	0	100%
23. Maintained proper control over courtroom	16	62%	6	23%	2	8%	2	8%	0	0%	3.38	26	1	92%
24. Prompt in making rulings and rendering decisions	12	44%	10	37%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.22	27	0	96%
25. Was prepared for the proceedings	16	59%	6	22%	4	15%	1	4%	0	0%	3.37	27	0	96%
26. Efficient management of the calendar	13	52%	7	28%	3	12%	2	8%	0	0%	3.24	25	2	92%
Category Total	69	52%	39	30%	18	14%	6	5%	0	0%	3.30	132		

	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	17	71%	2	8%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	3.42	24	3	92%
Category Total	17	71%	2	8%	3	13%	2	8%	0	0%	3.42	24		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Litigant Witness Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Rosales

	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	20	57%	6	17%	3	9%	0	0%	6	17%	2.97	35	0	83%
2. Equal treatment regardless of race	22	71%	2	6%	4	13%	0	0%	3	10%	3.29	31	4	90%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	21	62%	4	12%	2	6%	1	3%	6	18%	2.97	34	1	79%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	18	69%	2	8%	5	19%	0	0%	1	4%	3.38	26	9	96%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	19	66%	3	10%	5	17%	0	0%	2	7%	3.28	29	6	93%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	20	71%	4	14%	2	7%	0	0%	2	7%	3.43	28	7	93%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	21	66%	5	16%	1	3%	1	3%	4	13%	3.19	32	3	84%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	20	71%	3	11%	3	11%	0	0%	2	7%	3.39	28	7	93%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	21	62%	5	15%	2	6%	2	6%	4	12%	3.09	34	1	82%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>12%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3.21</b>	<b>277</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	21	60%	5	14%	4	11%	0	0%	5	14%	3.06	35	0	86%
11. Explained reasons for delays	16	59%	4	15%	3	11%	2	7%	2	7%	3.11	27	8	85%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>60%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>15%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>3.08</b>	<b>62</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	22	63%	2	6%	4	11%	0	0%	7	20%	2.91	35	0	80%
13. Dignified	23	70%	2	6%	3	9%	0	0%	5	15%	3.15	33	2	85%
14. Courteous	21	60%	4	11%	5	14%	2	6%	3	9%	3.09	35	0	86%
15. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the court	22	65%	2	6%	4	12%	1	3%	5	15%	3.03	34	1	82%
16. Patient	22	63%	3	9%	3	9%	3	9%	4	11%	3.03	35	0	80%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>8%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>172</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	18	51%	7	20%	5	14%	2	6%	3	9%	3.00	35	0	86%
18. Maintained proper control of courtroom	21	60%	7	20%	3	9%	1	3%	3	9%	3.20	35	0	89%
19. Was prepared for the proceedings	17	49%	6	17%	7	20%	2	6%	3	9%	2.91	35	0	86%
<b>Category Total</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>53%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>19%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>9%</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>105</b>		

2024 Judicial Performance Review

Staff Survey Responses

Hon. Judge Rosales

	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	11	79%	0	0%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.57	14	0	100%
2. Equal Treatment regardless of race	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0	100%
3. Equal treatment regardless of gender	8	57%	3	21%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.36	14	0	100%
4. Equal treatment regardless of religion	7	58%	2	17%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	12	2	100%
5. Equal treatment regardless of national origin	8	67%	1	8%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.42	12	2	100%
6. Equal treatment regardless of disability	7	58%	2	17%	3	25%	0	0%	0	0%	3.33	12	2	100%
7. Equal treatment regardless of age	8	62%	2	15%	3	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.38	13	1	100%
8. Equal treatment regardless of sexual orientation	6	55%	2	18%	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	3.27	11	3	100%
9. Equal treatment regardless of economic status	9	64%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	0	0%	3.43	14	0	100%
Category Total	73	63%	16	14%	27	23%	0	0%	0	0%	3.40	116		

	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	7	50%	4	29%	2	14%	0	0%	1	7%	3.14	14	0	93%
Category Total	7	50%	4	29%	2	14%	0	0%	1	7%	3.14	14		

	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	10	71%	1	7%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	3.43	14	0	93%
12. Dignified	9	64%	1	7%	3	21%	1	7%	0	0%	3.29	14	0	93%
13. Courteous	9	64%	2	14%	2	14%	0	0%	1	7%	3.29	14	0	93%
14. Conduct that promotes public confidence in the Court and commissioner's ability	8	57%	2	14%	3	21%	0	0%	1	7%	3.14	14	0	93%
15. Patient	8	57%	3	21%	2	14%	0	0%	1	7%	3.21	14	0	93%
Category Total	44	63%	9	13%	12	17%	2	3%	3	4%	3.27	70		

	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	8	62%	1	8%	4	31%	0	0%	0	0%	3.31	13	1	100%
17. Maintained proper control in the courtroom	7	54%	3	23%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	3.15	13	1	92%
18. Was prepared for proceedings	8	62%	2	15%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	3.23	13	1	92%
19. Respectful treatment of staff	10	71%	2	14%	1	7%	0	0%	1	7%	3.43	14	0	93%
20. Cooperation with peers	6	67%	1	11%	1	11%	0	0%	1	11%	3.22	9	5	89%
21. Efficient management of the calendar	6	46%	4	31%	2	15%	0	0%	1	8%	3.08	13	1	92%
Category Total	45	60%	13	17%	12	16%	0	0%	5	7%	3.24	75		