

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

NYS Supreme Court Decisions in Article 78
Proceedings

Court Litigation Documents

January 2020

Decision in CPLR Article 78 proceedings - Mercado, Freddie (2017-03-24)

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

Recommended Citation

"Decision in CPLR Article 78 proceedings - Mercado, Freddie (2017-03-24)" (2020). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/pdd/111>

This Parole Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Court Litigation Documents at FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in NYS Supreme Court Decisions in Article 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.

SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK
COUNTY OF ORANGE

 COPY

-----X
In the Matter of the Application of
FREDDIE MERCADO, DIN 82-A-5907

DECISION & ORDER

INDEX NO. 1676/2016

Petitioner,

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

-against-

TINA M. STANFORD, Chairwoman,
NEW YORK STATE BOARD OF PAROLE,

Respondent.

-----X
P R E S E N T : HON. ELAINE SLOBOD, JSC

The following sets of papers numbered 1 to 4 were considered on the petitioner's application for a judgment annulling the determination of the Parole Board which denied him parole and granting him a *de novo* hearing:

Order to show cause; petition and exhibits 1-11	1,2
Answer and return and exhibits 1-11 (exhibits 1, 3 and 11 submitted separately for in camera review)	3
Reply	4

Upon review of the foregoing, it is hereby ORDERED that the petitioner's application for a *de novo* hearing is granted. The petitioner's *de novo* hearing shall be before a board whose members have not previously reviewed the petitioner's applications for parole. Further, the sentencing minutes of February 20, 1987 (Browne, J.) shall be removed from the petitioner's file prior to the hearing.

If a denial of parole could be based upon the seriousness of the petitioner's underlying offense alone, the Court would affirm the Board's decision. This, however, is not the case. See *Ramirez v Evans*, 118 AD3d 707 (2d Dept 2014). Here, no other reason was articulated by the Board for its conclusory findings that granting parole "would not be compatible with the welfare of society at large, and would tend to deprecate the seriousness of the instant offenses and undermine respect for the law."

This decision constitutes the order of the Court.

E N T E R

Dated: March 24, 2017
Goshen, New York

Elaine Slobod

HON. ELAINE SLOBOD, JSC

FREDDIE MERCADO, DIN 82-A-5907
Petitioner *Pro Se*
Otisville Correctional Facility
PO Box 8
Otisville, New York 10963

ERIC T. SCHNEIDERMAN
Attorney General of the State of New York
Jeane L. Strickland Smith, AAG, Of Counsel
Attorney for Respondent
One Civic Center Plaza, Suite 401
Poughkeepsie, New York 12601