

EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGES

1. These recommended Evaluation Criteria are grounded on the consideration that the public interest in improving the quality of our judicial system is best served by merit selection of judges and judicial commissioners.

2. The criteria are designed to ensure that nominees have the intellectual capacity, the efficiency and personal qualities which would enable them to resolve disputes impartially and decide solely upon the facts of the cases and the law. These criteria need to be rigorous, both in their articulation as well as in their application in the selection process.

3. The Evaluation Criteria are to provide minimum criteria and the presence of each criterion may vary according to the specific appointment under consideration. The demands of the particular office may require a different emphasis: The skills for a trial judge and an appellate judge differ. This is so with the exception of integrity which importance cannot be overstated.

4. The following are considered as the minimal essential qualities for successful performance of the judicial function:

- (i) [Integrity \(read more.. \)](#)
- (ii) [Legal Knowledge and Ability \(read more.. \)](#)
- (iii) [Professional Experience \(read more.. \)](#)
- (iv) [Judicial Temperament \(read more.. \)](#)
- (v) [Diligence \(read more.. \)](#)
- (vi) [Health \(read more.. \)](#)
- (vii) [Financial Responsibility \(read more.. \)](#)
- (viii) [Public Service \(read more.. \)](#)
- (ix) [Views on Public Issues \(read more.. \)](#)
- (x) [Desirable Special Qualities \(read more.. \)](#)

5. Merit selection cannot rely solely on these criteria alone. The procedure to be employed is

equally critical. Certainly a common information pool bearing on all candidates which the JAC can rely upon is indispensable.