

Fordham Law School

## FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

---

Decisions in Art. 78 Proceedings

Article 78 Litigation Documents

---

November 2019

### Decision in Art. 78 proceeding - Williams, Larry (2003-09-19)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/pdd>

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Decision in Art. 78 proceeding - Williams, Larry (2003-09-19)" (2019). Parole Information Project  
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/pdd/14>

This Parole Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Article 78 Litigation Documents at FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Decisions in Art. 78 Proceedings by an authorized administrator of FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. For more information, please contact [tmelnick@law.fordham.edu](mailto:tmelnick@law.fordham.edu).

STATE OF NEW YORK  
SUPREME COURT

COUNTY OF ALBANY

---

In the Matter of the Application of  
LARRY WILLIAMS, 99-A-2285,

Petitioner,

**DECISION AND ORDER**

For a Judgment Pursuant to Article 78  
of the Civil Practice Law and Rules,

-against-

Index No. 1448-03  
RJI # 01-03-ST3505

BRION D. TRAVIS, CHAIRMAN, NEW YORK  
STATE DIVISION OF PAROLE,

Respondent.

---

(Supreme Court, Albany County, Special Term)

APPEARANCES:

LARRY WILLIAMS  
Inmate No. 99-A-2285  
Petitioner, *Pro Se*  
Bare Hill Correctional Facility  
Caller Box 20  
Cady Road  
Malone, New York 12953

Albany County Clerk  
Document Number 9091400  
Rcvd 09/26/2003 10:27:56 AM



ELIOT SPITZER, ESQ.  
Attorney General of the State of New York  
(Kate H. Nepveu, Esq.,  
Assistant Attorney General, of Counsel)  
Attorneys for Respondent  
The Capitol  
Albany, New York 12224

Leslie E. Stein, J.:

Petitioner, an inmate at Bare Hill Correctional Facility, commenced the instant CPLR Article 78 proceeding to review his first denial of parole release. Petitioner is currently serving a sentence of four years to life on a conviction of Attempted Criminal Possession of a Weapon, Third Degree. Denial of parole was based primarily upon the severity of the crime.

The petition raises a number of grounds for relief. The Court finds that the only ground which has any merit is petitioner's contention that denial of parole was based upon erroneous information and was arbitrary and capricious. Specifically, it appears that respondent relied heavily upon the inmate status report for parole board appearance and on the pre-sentence report, which stated that the inmate had fired a handgun at a police officer during the course of the present offense. The factual basis for such claim is not found anywhere in the record before the parole board or this Court. Moreover, petitioner pleaded guilty to attempted criminal possession of a weapon. Although he was originally charged with Attempted Murder, First Degree and Aggravated Assault upon a Police Officer, as well as Criminal Possession of a Weapon, Second and Third Degrees, he has never been convicted of any crime which involved firing a weapon at a police officer.

The Division of Parole is required to consider the pre-sentence report in making parole release decisions (see Matter of Silmon v Travis, 95 NY2d 470, 476; Matter of Watkins v Annucci, 305 AD2d 889, 891). However, the Division of Parole may not consider alleged crimes for which an inmate has not been convicted and which he denies committing (see Matter of Edge v Hammock, 80 AD2d 953).

In the instant matter, petitioner has consistently denied shooting at the officer. Respondent has failed to submit a plea allocution or any other evidence that petitioner has admitted shooting at the officer (cf. Matter of Maciag v Hammock, 88 AD2d 1106), nor has petitioner plead guilty to any crime which included such an act (cf. Matter of Silmon v Travis, supra). Since the denial of parole was based upon the stated fact that petitioner shot at a pursuing

police officer, the determination is arbitrary and capricious and based upon an error of fact (see Matter of Edge v Hammock, supra; cf. Matter of Richburg v New York State Board of Parole, 284 AD2d 685).

Accordingly, it is


**ORDERED and ADJUDGED**, that the petition be and hereby is granted, with filing fee and disbursements to petitioner. Respondent's determination is hereby vacated and annulled and respondent is directed to provide a new parole release hearing to petitioner within 45 days of the date hereof.

This shall constitute the Decision and Order of the Court. All papers are returned to the attorneys for respondent, who are directed to enter this Decision and Order without notice and to serve petitioner with a copy of this Decision and Order with notice of entry.

SO ORDERED!

ENTER.

Dated: September 19, 2003  
Albany, New York

  
Leslie E. Stein, J.S.C.

Papers Considered:

1. Order to Show Cause dated March 17, 2003;
2. Petition dated February 13, 2003;
3. Answer dated May 13, 2003; Affirmation of Kate H. Nepveu, Esq. dated May 13, 2003, with Exhibits A-I annexed;
4. Petitioner's Reply dated May 20, 2003.