

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Decisions in Art. 78 Proceedings

Article 78 Litigation Documents

September 2021

Decision in Art. 78 proceeding - Jones, Lloyd N.X. (2008-12-17)

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

Recommended Citation

"Decision in Art. 78 proceeding - Jones, Lloyd N.X. (2008-12-17)" (2021). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/pdd/246>

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.

Matter of Jones v Alexander

2008 NY Slip Op 33442(U)

December 17, 2008

Supreme Court, Albany County

Docket Number: 4719-08

Judge: George B. Ceresia

Republished from New York State Unified Court System's E-Courts Service.
Search E-Courts (<http://www.nycourts.gov/ecourts>) for any additional information on this case.

This opinion is uncorrected and not selected for official publication.

STATE OF NEW YORK
SUPREME COURT

COUNTY OF ALBANY

In The Matter of LLOYD N. X. JONES, 88-A-7262,

Petitioner,

-against-

GEORGE B. ALEXANDER, CHAIRMAN,
NEW YORK STATE DIVISION OF PAROLE,

Respondent,

For A Judgment Pursuant to Article 78
of the Civil Practice Law and Rules.

Supreme Court Albany County Article 78 Term
Hon. George B. Ceresia, Jr., Supreme Court Justice Presiding
RJI # 01-08-ST9190 Index No. 4719-88 08

Appearances: Lloyd N. X. Jones,
Inmate No.88-A-7262
Petitioner, Pro Se
Elmira Correctional Facility
P.O. Box 500
1879 Davis Street
Elmira New York, 14902-0500

Andrew M. Cuomo
Attorney General
State of New York
Attorney For Respondent
The Capitol
Albany, New York 12224
(C. Harris Dague,
Assistant Attorney General
of Counsel)

DECISION/ORDER/JUDGMENT

George B. Ceresia, Jr., Justice

The petitioner, an inmate at Elmira Correctional Facility, has commenced the instant
CPLR Article 78 proceeding to review a determination of respondent made on October 23,

2007 to deny petitioner discretionary release on parole. The petitioner is serving concurrent terms of fifteen years to life for attempted murder in the first degree (two counts), fifteen years to life for kidnaping in the first degree (two counts), and a term of eight years to life for burglary in the second degree. The petitioner has been denied parole three times previously. Among the many arguments set forth in the petition, petitioner contends that the respondent failed to follow the statutory guidelines for parole determination set out in Executive Law §259-i (2) (c) (A). He mentions that two of his disciplinary determinations were reversed and expunged. He indicates that he has made plans to be reunited with his children and grandchildren upon being released. In the petitioner's view, the Parole Board ignored his accomplishments while incarcerated. The petitioner asserts that the Parole Board's determination, in not releasing him, violates the Double Jeopardy Clause of the United States Constitution. He also maintains that the twenty-four month hold was excessive and unnecessary.

The reasons for the respondent's determination to deny petitioner release on parole are set forth as follows:

"Parole denied. Your instant offense, Attempted Murder 1st, Kidnaping 1st, Burglary 2nd was committed while you were on Federal Supervision for Bank Robbery,. You also incurred a prior out of state conviction for attempted armed robbery.

"You have maintained a clean disciplinary record since your last parole board appearance.

"This panel notes your positive programmatic participation including completion of ART and RSAT as well as your continued productive work as a group leader. Following deliberation, this decision is based on review of the case record as well as the interview with parole board members."

As stated in Executive Law §259-i (2) (c) (A):

“Discretionary release on parole shall not be granted merely as a reward for good conduct or efficient performance of duties while confined but after considering if there is a reasonable probability that, if such inmate is released, he will live and remain at liberty without violating the law, and that his release is not incompatible with the welfare of society and will not so deprecate the seriousness of his crime as to undermine respect for law. In making the parole release decision, the guidelines adopted pursuant to subdivision four of section two hundred fifty-nine-c of this article shall require that the following be considered: (i) the institutional record including program goals and accomplishments, academic achievements, vocational education, training or work assignments, therapy and interpersonal relationships with staff and inmates; (ii) performance, if any, as a participant in a temporary release program; (iii) release plans including community resources, employment, education and training and support services available to the inmate; (iv) any deportation order issued by the federal government against the inmate []; (v) any statement made to the board by the crime victim or the victim’s representative []” (Executive Law §259-i [2] [c] [A]).

“Parole Release decisions are discretionary and, if made pursuant to statutory requirements, not reviewable” (Matter of Sinopoli v New York State Board of Parole, 189 AD2d 960, 960 [3rd Dept., 1993], citing Matter of McKee v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 157 AD2d 944). If the parole board's decision is made in accordance with the statutory requirements, the board's determination is not subject to judicial review (see Ristau v. Hammock, 103 AD2d 944 [3rd Dept., 1984]). Furthermore, only a “showing of irrationality bordering on impropriety” on the part of the Parole Board has been found to necessitate judicial intervention (see Matter of Silmon v Travis, 95 NY2d 470, 476 [2000], quoting Matter of Russo v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 50 NY2d 69, 77 [1980]). In the absence

of the above, there is no basis upon which to disturb the discretionary determination made by the Parole Board (see Matter of Perez v. New York State of Division of Parole, 294 AD2d 726 [3rd Dept., 2002]).

While the Court is mindful of the recent decision in Matter of Vaello v Parole Board (48 AD3d 1018 [3d Dept., 2008]), the Court is also aware of the decision in Matter of Silvero v Dennison (28 AD3d 859 [3d Dept., 2006]). In Vaello, the inmate's petition was granted, and the parole determination reversed, by reason that it was not apparent that the Parole Board considered any of the statutory factors set forth in Executive Law § 259-i. In Silvero, the Court held that the failure of the Parole Board to recite the precise statutory language of the first sentence of Executive Law § 259-i (2) (c) (A) to support its conclusion does not undermine its determination, so long as the underlying statutory criteria were considered (Silvero, supra, at 859-860). In this instance, in addition to mentioning the crimes for which the petitioner was convicted, the Parole Board also noted his clean disciplinary record, his positive programming, and his relationship with staff and other inmates (specifically with respect to being a group leader). A review of the transcript of the parole interview reveals that attention was paid to such factors as petitioner's institutional programming, his clean disciplinary record, and his plans upon release.

The decision was sufficiently detailed to inform the petitioner of the reasons for the denial of parole and it satisfied the requirements of Executive Law §259-i (see Matter of Siao-Pao, 11 NY3d 773 [2008]; Matter of Whitehead v. Russi, 201 AD2d 825 [3rd Dept., 1994]; Matter of Green v. New York State Division of Parole, 199 AD2d 677 [3rd Dept., 1993]). It is proper and, in fact, required, that the Parole Board consider the seriousness of

the inmate's crimes and their violent nature (see Matter of Weir v. New York State Division of Parole, 205 AD2d 906, 907 [3rd Dept., 1994]; Matter of Sinopoli v. New York State Board of Parole, 189 AD2d 960, *supra*; Matter of Dudley v Travis, 227 AD2d 863, [3rd Dept., 1996), as well as the inmate's criminal history (see Matter of Farid v Travis, 239 AD2d 629 [3rd Dept., 1997]; Matter of Cohen v Gonzalez, 254 AD2d 556 [3rd Dept., 1998]). The Parole Board is not required to enumerate or give equal weight to each factor that it considered in determining the inmate's application, or to expressly discuss each one (see Matter of Wise v New York State Division of Parole, 54 AD3d 463 [3rd Dept., 2008]). Nor must the parole board recite the precise statutory language set forth in the first sentence of Executive Law § 259-i (2) (c) (A) (see Matter of Silvero v Dennison, 28 AD3d 859 [3rd Dept., 2006]). In other words, “[w]here appropriate the Board may give considerable weight to, or place particular emphasis on, the circumstances of the crimes for which a petitioner is incarcerated, as well as a petitioner’s criminal history, together with the other statutory factors, in determining whether the individual ‘will live and remain at liberty without violating the law,’ whether his or her ‘release is not incompatible with the welfare of society,’ and whether release will ‘deprecate the seriousness of [the] crime as to undermine respect for [the] law’” (Matter of Durio v New York State Division of Parole, 3 AD3d 816 [3rd Dept., 2004], quoting Executive Law §259-i [2] [c] [A], other citations omitted).

Petitioner’s claims that the determination to deny parole is tantamount to a re-sentencing, in violation of the Double Jeopardy Clauses’s prohibition against multiple punishments are conclusory and without merit (see Matter of Bockeno v New York State

Parole Board, 227 AD2d 751 [3rd Dept., 1996]; Matter of Crews v New York State Executive Department Board of Appeals Unit, 281 AD2d 672 [3rd Dept., 2001]; Matter of Evans v Dennison, 13 Misc3d 1236A, [Sup. Ct., Westchester Co., 2006]). The fact that an inmate has served his or her minimum sentence does not confer upon the inmate a protected liberty interest in parole release (see Matter of Motti v Alexander, 54 AD3d 1114, 1115 [3rd Dept., 2008]). The Parole Board is vested with the discretion to determine whether release was appropriate notwithstanding the fact that the sentencing court set the minimum term of petitioner's sentence (see Matter of Silmon v Travis, 95 NY2d 470, 476 [2000]; Matter of Cody v Dennison, 33 AD2d 1141, 1142 [3rd Dept., 2006] lv denied 8 NY3d 802 [2007]; Matter of Burress v Dennison, 37 AD3d 930 [3rd Dept., 2007]).

With regard to petitioner's arguments concerning an alleged violation of his right to due process, the Court first observes that there is no inherent right to parole under the constitution of either the United States or the State of New York (see Greenholtz v Inmates of the Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex, 442 US 1, 7 [1979]; Matter of Russo v New York State Bd. of Parole, 50 NY2d 69, 73, supra). It has been repeatedly held that Executive Law § 259-i does not create in any prisoner an entitlement to, or a legitimate expectation of, release; therefore, no constitutionally protected liberty interests are implicated by the Parole Board's exercise of its discretion to deny parole (see Barna v Travis, 239 F3d 169, 171 [2d Cir., 2001]; Marvin v Goord, 255 F3d 40, 44 [2d Cir., 2001]; Boothe v Hammock, 605 F2d 661, 664 [2d Cir., 1979]; Paunetto v Hammock, 516 F Supp 1367, 1367-1368 [SD NY, 1981]; Matter of Russo v New York State Bd. of Parole, 50 NY2d 69, 75-76, supra, Matter of Gamez v Dennison, 18 AD3d 1099 [3rd Dept., 2005]; Matter of Lozada v

New York State Div. of Parole, 36 AD3d 1046, 1046 [3rd Dept., 2007]). The Court, accordingly, finds no due process violation.

In addition, the Parole Board's decision to hold petitioner for the maximum period (24 months) is within the Board's discretion and was supported by the record (see Matter of Tatta v State of New York Division of Parole, 290 AD2d 907 [3rd Dept., 2002], lv denied 98 NY2d 604).

The Court has reviewed petitioner's remaining arguments and finds them to be without merit.

The Court finds the decision of the Parole Board was not irrational, in violation of lawful procedure, affected by an error of law, irrational or arbitrary and capricious. The petition must therefore be dismissed.


Accordingly, it is

ORDERED and ADJUDGED, that the petition be and hereby is dismissed.

This shall constitute the decision, order and judgment of the Court. All papers are returned to the attorney for the respondent who is directed to enter this Decision/Order/Judgment without notice and to serve petitioner with a copy of this Decision/Order with notice of entry.

ENTER

Dated: December 17, 2008
Troy, New York



Supreme Court Justice
George B. Ceresia, Jr.

Papers Considered:

1. Order To Show Cause dated July 8, 2008, Petition, Supporting Papers and Exhibits
2. Respondent's Answer dated August 28, 2008 , Supporting Papers and Exhibits
3. Petitioner's Reply Brief dated September 24, 2008, With Attachments