

Fordham Law School

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

---

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Administrative Appeal Documents

---

December 2020

### Administrative Appeal Decision - Salamanca, Donna (2018-12-28)

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Salamanca, Donna (2018-12-28)" (2020). Parole Information Project  
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/121>

This Parole Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Parole Administrative Appeal Documents at FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History. It has been accepted for inclusion in Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions 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- BOARD OF PAROLE

**Administrative Appeal Decision Notice**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**NYSID No.:** [REDACTED]

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appearances:**

For the Board, the Appeals Unit

For Appellant:

Donna Salamanca 17G0967  
Edgecombe Correctional Facility  
611 Edgecombe Avenue  
New York, New York 10032

**Board Member(s) who participated in appealed from decision:** Crangle, Smith

**Decision appealed from:** 5/2018-Denial of SHOCK release, with imposition of hold to PIE date.


**Pleadings considered:** Brief on behalf of the pro se appellant received on October 23, 2018.  
Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings and Recommendation

**Documents relied upon:** Presentence Investigation Report, Parole Board Report, Parole Board Release Decision (Form 9026), COMPAS, TAP/Case Plan.

**Final Determination:** The undersigned have determined that the decision from which this appeal was taken be and the same is hereby

  
Commissioner

☒ Affirmed ☐ Reversed for De Novo Interview ☐ Modified to \_\_\_\_\_

  
Commissioner

☒ Affirmed ☐ Reversed for De Novo Interview ☐ Modified to \_\_\_\_\_

  
Commissioner

☒ Affirmed ☐ Reversed for De Novo Interview ☐ Modified to \_\_\_\_\_

***If the Final Determination is at variance with Findings and Recommendation of Appeals Unit, written reasons for the Parole Board's determination must be annexed hereto.***

This Final Determination, the related Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings and the separate findings of the Parole Board, if any, were mailed to the Inmate and the Inmate's Counsel, if any, on 12/28/18.  
LB

Distribution: Appeals Unit - Inmate - Inmate's Counsel - Inst. Parole File - Central File  
P-2002(B) (5/2011)

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:**

The pro se appellant has submitted a brief to serve as the perfected appeal. The brief raises five primary issues: 1) the decision is arbitrary and capricious in that the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the required statutory factors. Appellant contends she has an excellent institutional record and release plan, and that no aggravating factors exist, but all the Board did was to look only at the instant offense/criminal history. Appellant alleges the Board failed to provide detail or future guidance, and issued a predetermined decision which illegally resentenced her. This is in violation of the due process clause. 2) the SHOCK program is a contract with DOCCS that she complied with. 3) the Board failed to verify the veracity of the victim impact statements. 4) the statement submitted to the Board was not written by her, but by her counselor. 5) the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law in that the COMPAS had errors on it, and was ignored by the Board. Also, the statutes are no rehabilitation and present/future based. Nor are there any of the required written procedures in place.

As for the first claim, pursuant to Executive Law §259-i(2)(c), the Parole Board must consider criteria which is relevant to the specific inmate, including, but not limited to, the inmate's institutional record or criminal behavior, giving whatever emphasis they so choose to each factor. In re Garcia v. New York State Division of Parole, 239 A.D.2d 235, 657 N.Y.S.2d 415 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 1997); People ex rel. Herbert v. New York State Board of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 1983). The Board is not required to give equal weight to each statutory factor. Arena v New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 156 A.D.3d 1101, 65 N.Y.S.3d 471 (3d Dept. 2017); Mays v Stanford, 150 A.D.3d 1521, 55 N.Y.S.3d 502 (3d Dept. 2017); Marszalek v Stanford, 152 A.D.3d 773, 59 N.Y.S.3d 432 (2d Dept. 2017); Paniagua v Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1018, 56 N.Y.S.3d 894 (3d Dept. 2017); Esquilin v New York State Board of Parole, 144 A.D.3d 846, 40 N.Y.S.3d 279 (2<sup>nd</sup> Dept. 2016); Kenefick v Sticht, 139 A.D.3d 1380, 31 N.Y.S.3d 367 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2016); LeGeros v New York State Board of Parole, 139 A.D.3d 1068, 30 N.Y.S.3d 834 (2d Dept. 2016); De la Cruz v Annucci, 122 A.D.3d 1413, 997 N.Y.S.2d 872 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2014); Phillips v Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 2007); That an inmate has numerous achievements within a prison's institutional setting does not automatically entitle her to parole release. Matter of Faison v. Travis, 260 A.D.2d 866, 688 N.Y.S.2d 782 (3d Dept. 1999); Pulliam v Dennison, 38 A.D.3d 963, 832 N.Y.S.2d 304 (3d Dept. 2007). Moreover, per Executive Law §259-i(2)(c), an application for parole release shall not be granted merely as a reward for appellant's good conduct or achievements while incarcerated. Larrier v New York State Board of Parole Appeals Unit, 283 A.D.2d 700, 723 N.Y.S.2d 902, 903 (3d Dept 2001); Vasquez v State of New York Executive Department, Division of Parole, 20 A.D.3d 668, 797 N.Y.S.2d 655 (3d Dept. 2005); Wellman v Dennison, 23 A.D.3d 974, 805 N.Y.S.2d 159 (3d Dept. 2005).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 1)

The Board is obligated to consider the inmate's prior criminal record. Matter of Partee v Evans, 117 A.D.3d 1258, 984 N.Y.S.2d 894 (3d Dept. 2014). The Board may put more weight on the inmate's criminal history. Bello v Board of Parole, 149 A.D.3d 1458, 53 N.Y.S.3d 715 (3d Dept. 2017); Hall v New York State Division of Parole, 66 A.D.3d 1322, 886 N.Y.S.2d 835 (3d Dept. 2009); Davis v Evans, 105 A.D.3d 1305, 963 N.Y.S.2d 485 (3d Dept. 2013); Jones v New York State Parole Board, 127 A.D.3d 1327, 6 N.Y.S.3d 774 (3d Dept. 2015); Wade v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017). The fact that the Board afforded greater weight to the inmate's criminal history, and not to an alleged positive institutional adjustment, does not render the denial of parole for that reason irrational or improper. Matter of Ortiz v. Hammock, 96 A.D.2d 735, 465 N.Y.S.2d 341 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept 1983); Peo. ex rel. Yates v. Walters, 111 A.D.2d 839, 490 N.Y.S.2d 573 (2d Dept. 1985); Matter of Ristau v. Hammock, 103 A.D.2d 944, 479 N.Y.S.2d 760 (3d Dept. 1984) lv. to appeal den. 63 N.Y.2d 608, 483 N.Y.S.2d 1023 (1984); Torres v New York State Division of Parole, 300 A.D.2d 128, 750 N.Y.S.2d 759 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 2002); Lashway v Evans, 110 A.D.3d 1420, 973 N.Y.S.2d 496 (3d Dept. 2013).

The denial of parole release based upon nature of conviction and criminal history is appropriate. In the Matter of Hawkins v. Travis, 259 A.D.2d 813, 686 N.Y.S.2d 198 (3d Dept. 1999); Farid v. Russi, 217 A.D.2d 832, 629 N.Y.S.2d 821 (3d Dept. 1995); Charlemagne v New York State Division of Parole, 281 A.D.2d 669, 722 N.Y.S.2d 74, 75 (3d Dept 2001); Burress v Evans, 107 A.D.3d 1216, 967 N.Y.S.2d 486 (3d Dept. 2013); Boccadisi v Stanford, 133 A.D.3d 1169, 20 N.Y.S.3d 477 (3d Dept. 2015); Bush v Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017); Holmes v Annucci, 151 A.D.3d 1954, 57 N.Y.S.3d 857 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2017).

Per Executive Law 259-i(2)(c)(A), the Board is obligated to consider the inmate's prior criminal record and the nature of the instant offenses, and the fact that such consideration resulted in a parole denial does not reflect irrationality bordering on impropriety. Singh v Evans, 118 A.D.3d 1209, 987 N.Y.S.2d 271 (3d Dept. 2014).

The Board may place particular emphasis upon the nature of the offense. Mullins v New York State Board of Parole, 136 A.D.3d 1141, 25 N.Y.S.3d 698 (3d Dept. 2016). The Board in its discretion properly placed greater emphasis on the present offenses, as it is not required to give equal weight to all requisite factors. Wiley v State of New York Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 139 A.D.3d 1289, 32 N.Y.S.3d 370 (3d Dept. 2016); Peralta v New York State Board of Parole, 157 A.D.3d 1151, 69 N.Y.S.3d 885 (3d Dept. 2018).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 2)

The Board may cite the devious, manipulative and cunning acts committed by the inmate against people whom had placed their trust in the inmate. Romer v Dennison, 24 A.D.3d 866, 804 N.Y.S.2d 872 (3d Dept. 2005).

A claim that the denial of parole release amounted to a resentencing is without merit. Kalwasinski v Patterson, 80 A.D.3d 1065, 915 N.Y.S.2d 715 (3d Dept. 2011) lv.app.den. 16 N.Y.3d 710, 922 N.Y.S.2d 273 (2011); Marnell v Dennison, 35 A.D.3d 995, 824 N.Y.S.2d 812 (3d Dept. 2006) lv.den. 8 N.Y.3d 807, 833 N.Y.S.2d 426; Murray v Evans, 83 A.D.3d 1320, 920 N.Y.S.2d 745 (3d Dept. 2011); Gonzalez v Chair, New York State Board of Parole, 72 A.D.3d 1368, 898 N.Y.S.2d 737 (3d Dept. 2010); Borcsok v New York State Division of Parole, 34 A.D.3d 961, 823 N.Y.S.2d 310 (3d Dept. 2006) lv.den. 8 N.Y.3d 803, 830 N.Y.S.2d 699. The Board was vested with discretion to determine whether release was appropriate, notwithstanding what the minimum period of incarceration which was set by the Court. Cody v Dennison, 33 A.D.3d 1141, 1142 (3d Dept. 2006), lv.den. 8 N.Y.3d 2007; Burress v Dennison, 37 A.D.3d 930, 829 N.Y.S.2d 283 (3d Dept. 2007).

There is a presumption of honesty and integrity that attaches to Judges and administrative fact-finders. People ex.rel. Johnson v New York State Board of Parole, 180 A.D.2d 914, 580 N.Y.S.2d 957, 959 (3d Dept 1992); Withrow v Larkin, 421 U.S. 35, 47, 95 S.Ct. 1456, 43 L.Ed2d 712 (1975). And, Courts presume the Parole Board follows its statutory commands and internal policies in fulfilling its obligations. Garner v Jones, 529 U.S. 244, 120 S.Ct. 1362, 1371, 146 L.Ed2d 236 (2000). The decision was not predetermined. Dean v New York State Division of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1207, 801 N.Y.S.2d 92 (3d Dept. 2005) lv. den. 6 N.Y.3d 705 (2006); Hakim-Zaki v New York State Division of Parole, 29 A.D.3d 1190, 814 N.Y.S.2d 414 (3d Dept. 2006). There is no merit to the inmate's contention that the parole interview was improperly conducted or that he was denied a fair interview. Black v New York State Board of Parole, 54 A.D.3d 1076, 863 N.Y.S.2d 521 (3d Dept. 2008); Rivers v Evans, 119 A.D.3d 1188, 989 N.Y.S.2d 400 (3d Dept. 2014); Mays v Stanford, 150 A.D.3d 1521, 55 N.Y.S.3d 502 (3d Dept. 2017).

The Board may deny parole release without the existence of any aggravating factors, no matter how exemplary the institutional record is. Hamilton v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 1272, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 3)

As for due process/constitutional liberty interest in a legitimate expectation of early release, at the Federal level, there is no inherent constitutional right to parole. Greenholtz v Inmates of Nebraska Penal and Correctional Complex, 442 U.S. 1, 99 S.Ct. 2100, 2104, 60 L.Ed2d 668 (1979) or to be released before the expiration of a valid sentence. Swarthout v Cooke, 562 U.S. 216, 131 S.Ct. 859, 178 L.Ed2d 732 (2011). Nor, under the New York State Constitution, is there a due process right to parole. Russo v New York State Board of Parole, 50 N.Y.2d 69, 427 N.Y.S.2d 982, 984 (1980); Boothe v. Hammock, 605 F.2d 661 (2d Cir. 1979). The New York State parole scheme is not one that creates in any prisoner a legitimate expectancy of release. No entitlement to release is created by the parole provisions. Accordingly, appellant has no liberty interest in parole. Duettel v Fischer, 368 Fed.Appx. 180, 182 (2d Cir. 2010); Davis v Dennison, 219 Fed Appx 68 (2d Cir. 2007), cert. den. 552 U.S. 863, 128 S.Ct. 151, 169 L.Ed2d 103 (2007); Rodriguez v Alexander, 71 A.D.3d 1354, 896 N.Y.S.2d 693 (3d Dept. 2010), lv. den. 15 N.Y.3d 703, 906 N.Y.S.2d 817. Thus, the protections of the due process clause are inapplicable. Barna v Travis, 239 F.3d 169, 171 (2d Cir. 2001); Freeman v New York State Division of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1174, 800 N.Y.S.2d 797 (3d Dept 2005); Watson v New York State Board of Parole, 78 A.D.3d 1367, 910 N.Y.S.2d 311 (3d Dept. 2010).

Completion of the minimum term of the sentence still does not create any protected liberty interest. Motti v Alexander, 54 A.D.3d 1114, 1115 (3d Dept. 2008).

Nothing in the due process clause requires the Parole Board to specify the particular evidence on which rests the discretionary determination an inmate is not ready for conditional release. Duettel v Fischer, 368 Fed.Appx. 180, 182 (2d Cir. 2010). There is no due process requirement that the Parole Board disclose its release criteria. Haymes v Regan, 525 F.2d 540 (2d Cir. 1975).

The due process clause is not violated by the Board's balancing of the statutory criteria, and which is not to be second guessed by the courts. Mathie v Dennison, 2007 WL 2351072 (S.D.N.Y. 2007); MacKenzie v Cunningham, 2014 WL 5089395 (S.D.N.Y. 2014).

Parole is not constitutionally based, but is a creature of statute which may be imposed subject to conditions imposed by the state legislature. Banks v Stanford, 159 A.D.3d 134, 71 N.Y.S.3d 515 (2d Dept. 2018).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 4)

The Board set forth in adequate detail the reasons for its denial of the inmate's request for release. Burress v Evans, 107 A.D.3d 1216, 967 N.Y.S.2d 486 (3d Dept. 2013). The written Board decision in this case contains sufficient detail. McLain v New York State Division of Parole, 204 A.D.2d 456, 611 N.Y.S.2d 629 (2d Dept 1994); Walker v Russi, 176 A.D.2d 1185, 576 N.Y.S.2d 51 (3d Dept 1991), appeal dismissed 79 N.Y.2d 897, 581 N.Y.S.2d 660 (1992); Thomas v Superintendent of Arthur Kill Correctional Facility, 124 A.D.2d 848, 508 N.Y.S.2d 564 (2d Dept 1986), appeal dismissed 69 N.Y.2d 611, 517 N.Y.S.2d 1025 (1987); De la Cruz v Annucci, 122 A.D.3d 1413, 997 N.Y.S.2d 872 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2014); Betancourt v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1497, 49 N.Y.S.3d 315 (3d Dept. 2017); Robinson v New York State Board of Parole, 162 A.D.3d 1450, 81 N.Y.S.3d 235 (3d Dept. 2018); Applegate v New York State Board of Parole, 164 A.D.3d 996, 82 N.Y.S.3d 240 (3d Dept. 2018).

As for a lack of future guidance, there is no due process right to an inmate obtaining a statement as to what he should do to improve his chances for parole in the future. Boothe v Hammock, 605 F.2d 661 (2d Cir. 1979); Watkins v Caldwell, 54 A.D.2d 42, 387 N.Y.S.2d 177 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept 1976); Freeman v New York State Division of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1174, 800 N.Y.S.2d 797 (3d Dept 2005); Francis v New York State Division of Parole, 89 A.D.3d 1312, 934 N.Y.S.2d 514 (3d Dept. 2011). There is no legal requirement that a second Parole Board panel must follow the recommendation of a prior Parole Board panel, nor that the same members should constitute both panels. Flores v New York State Board of Parole, 210 A.D.2d 555, 620 N.Y.S.2d 141, 142 (3d Dept 1994).

Denial of parole is neither arbitrary nor capricious when the Parole Board relied on the factors defined by the New York statute. Hodge v Griffin, 2014 WL 2453333(S.D.N.Y. 2014) citing Romer v Travis, 2003 WL 21744079. An arbitrary action is one without sound basis in reason and without regard to the facts. Rationality is what is reviewed under an arbitrary and capricious standard. Hamilton v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014). An action is arbitrary and capricious when it is taken without sound basis in reason or regard to the facts. Ward v City of Long Beach, 20 N.Y.3d 1042 (2013).

Since the Board's decision was sufficiently detailed to inform the inmate of the reasons for the denial of parole, it satisfied the criteria set out in section 259-i of the Executive Law. Siao-Pao v Dennison, 11 N.Y.3d 777, 866 N.Y.S.2d 602 (Ct. App. 2008); Matter of Whitehead v. Russi, 201 A.D.2d 825, 607 N.Y.S.2d 751 (3d Dept. 1993); Matter of Green v. New York State Division of Parole, 199 A.D.2d 677, 605 N.Y.S.2d 148 (3d Dept. 1993).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 5)

Moreover, the reasons stated by the Parole Board members for holding appellant are sufficient grounds to support their decision. People ex rel. Yates v. Walters, 111 A.D.2d 839, 490 N.Y.S.2d 573 (2d Dept. 1985); Matter of Ganci v Hammock, 99 A.D.2d 546, 471 N.Y.S.2d 630 (2d Dept. 1984); Matter of Vuksanaj v. Hammock, 93 A.D.2d 958, 463 N.Y.S.2d 61 (3d Dept. 1983); Matter of Pina v. Hammock, 89 A.D.2d 799, 453 N.Y.S.2d 479 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 1982). Since the Board's challenged decision was made in accordance with the pertinent statutory requirements, it exercised proper discretion in denying appellant early release on parole. In the Matter of Hawkins v. Travis, 259 A.D.2d 813, 686 N.Y.S.2d 198 (3d Dept. 1999), app. dism. 93 N.Y.2d 1033, 697 N.Y.S.2d 556 (1999); Matter of Barrett v. New York State Division of Parole, 242 A.D.2d 763, 661 N.Y.S.2d 857 (3d Dept. 1997).

As for appellant's second claim, a prisoner taking all DOCS recommended programs does not create a contract obligation for parole release, which is instead discretionary and based upon a consideration of statutorily mandated factors. Germenis v Cunningham, 73 A.D.3<sup>rd</sup> 1297, 899 N.Y.S.2d 907 (3d Dept. 2010); St. Pierre v Cunningham, 73 A.D.3d 1310, 899 N.Y.S.2d 913 (3d Dept. 2010); MacKenzie v Cunningham, 78 A.D.3d 1434, 910 N.Y.S.2d 706 (3d Dept. 2010); Grate v Artus, 160 A.D.3d 1433, 72 N.Y.S.3d 900 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2018).

As for appellant's third claim, whether or not any victim impact statements even exist in this case is a confidential matter.

As for appellant's fourth claim, appellant knew well in advance when the Parole Board would review her file, and was free to submit an updated statement. Appellant chose not to do so, thereby waiving the issue. Matter of Shaffer v. Leonardo, 179 A.D.2d 980, 579 N.Y.S.2d 910 (3d Dept. 1992); Boddie v New York State Division of Parole, 288 F.Supp.2d 431 (S.D.N.Y. 2003).

As for appellant's final claim, any allegation that the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law is rejected. Dolan v New York State Board of Parole, 122 A.D.3d 1058, 995 N.Y.S.2d 850 (3d Dept. 2014); Tran v Evans, 126 A.D.3d 1196, 3 N.Y.S.3d 633 (3d Dept. 2015); Bocadisi v Stanford, 133 A.D.3d 1169, 20 N.Y.S.3d 477 (3d Dept. 2015). Furthermore, the 2011 Executive Law amendments have been incorporated into the regulations adopted by the Board in 2017. So, written procedures do in fact exist.

The alleged errors on her COMPAS were in fact corrected and submitted to the Board.



STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Salamanca, Donna

**Facility:** Edgecombe Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 17G0967

**Appeal Control #:** 06-121-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 6)

The 2011 amendments to the Executive Law, as well as the state regulations governing parole, do not create a legitimate expectancy of release that would give rise to a due process interest in parole. Fuller v Evans, 586 Fed.Appx. 825 (2d Cir. 2014) cert.den. 135 S.Ct. 2807, 192 L.Ed2d 851. Parole is not constitutionally based, but is a creature of statute which may be imposed subject to conditions imposed by the state legislature. Banks v Stanford, 159 A.D.3d 134, 71 N.Y.S.3d 515 (2d Dept. 2018).

The 2011 amendments still permit the Board to place greater emphasis on the gravity of the crime. Matter of Montane v Evans, 116 A.D.3d 197, 981 N.Y.S.2d 866 (3d Dept.) appeal dismissed 24 N.Y.3d 1052, 999 N.Y.S.2d 360 (2014); Hamilton v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014); Moore v New York State Board of Parole, 137 A.D.3d 1375, 26 N.Y.S.3d 412 (3d Dept. 2016). The Board can still consider the nature of the inmate's crimes, the criminal history, the prison disciplinary record, the program accomplishments and post release plans. Rivera v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1107, 990 N.Y.S.2d 295 (3d Dept. 2014). The Board is obligated to consider the serious nature of the crime. Khatib v New York State Board of Parole, 118 A.D.3d 1207, 988 N.Y.S.2d 286 (3d Dept. 2014).

The COMPAS can contain negative factors that support the Board's conclusion. Wade v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017). Even a positive COMPAS score does not create any guarantee to release, but rather is only one factor considered by the Board in exercising its discretion when making a parole determination. Rivera v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1107, 990 N.Y.S.2d 295 (3d Dept. 2014); Dawes v Beale, 122 A.D.3d 1059, 994 N.Y.S.2d 747 (3d Dept. 2014); Byas v Fischer, 120 A.D.3d 1586, 992 N.Y.S.2d 813 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2014); Matter of Montane v Evans, 116 A.D.3d 197, 981 N.Y.S.2d 866 (3d Dept.) appeal dismissed 24 N.Y.3d 1052, 999 N.Y.S.2d 360 (2014); LeGeros v New York State Board of Parole, 139 A.D.3d 1068, 30 N.Y.S.3d 834 (2d Dept. 2016); Wiley v State of New York Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 139 A.D.3d 1289, 32 N.Y.S.3d 370 (3d Dept. 2016).

**Recommendation:**

Accordingly, it is recommended the decision of the Board be affirmed.