

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 - Rood, Geneia (2018-12-28)

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Rood, Geneia (2018-12-28)" (2020). Parole Information Project  
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/164>

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).

Administrative Appeal Decision Notice

Inmate Name: Rood, Geneia

Facility: Albion Correctional Facility

NYSID No. [REDACTED]

Appeal Control #: 07-159-18-B

Dept. DIN#: 14G0218

Appearances:

For the Board, the Appeals Unit

For Appellant:

Geneia Rood 14G0218  
Albion Correctional Facility  
3595 State School Road  
Albion, New York 14411




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

Decision appealed from: 7/2018-Denial of discretionary release, with imposition of 18 month hold.

Pleadings considered: Brief on behalf of the pro se appellant received on October 2, 2018.  
Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings and Recommendation

Documents relied upon: Presentence Investigation Report, Parole Board Report, Interview Transcript,  
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed	<input type="checkbox"/> Reversed for De Novo Interview	<input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
 Commissioner	<input type="checkbox"/> Affirmed	<input type="checkbox"/> Reversed for De Novo Interview	<input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
 Commissioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed	<input type="checkbox"/> Reversed for De Novo Interview	<input type="checkbox"/> 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:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

**Findings:**

The pro se appellant has submitted a brief to serve as the perfected appeal. The brief raises four primary issues.

Appellant's first claim is the decision is arbitrary and capricious, and irrational bordering on impropriety, 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, but all the Board did was to look only at the instant offense/criminal history. Appellant alleges the Board decision lacks substantial evidence, and illegally resentenced her.

In response, 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 him 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:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-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 can give greater weight to statements made in the sentencing minutes. Williams v New York State Division of Parole, 114 A.D.3d 992, 979 N.Y.S.2d 868 (3d Dept. 2014). The Board is entitled to rely on the sentencing minutes. Platten v New York State Board of Parole, 153 A.D.3d 1509, 59 N.Y.S.3d 921 (3d Dept. 2017).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

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

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). The risk in the crime of hurting innocent bystanders may also be considered. Saunders v Travis, 238 A.D.2d 688, 656 N.Y.S.2d 404, 405 (3d Dept 1997), leave to appeal denied 90 N.Y.2d 805, 661 N.Y.S.2d 831 (1997).

The Board may cite an inmate's prior history of irresponsible driving in its decision. Confoy v New York State Division of Parole, 173 A.D.2d 1014, 569 N.Y.S.2d 846, 847 (3d Dept 1991); Wade v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017).

The Board could consider a history of alcohol abuse in its decision. Mclain v New York State Division of Parole, 204 A.D.2d 456, 611 N.Y.S.2d 629, 630 (2d Dept 1994).

The consideration by the Board of prison disciplinary violations is also appropriate. People ex rel. Henson v Miller, 244 A.D.2d 729, 664 N.Y.S.2d 655 (3d Dept 1997), leave to appeal denied 91 N.Y.2d 809, 670 N.Y.S.2d 403 (1998); Warburton v Department of Correctional Services, 254 A.D.2d 659, 680 N.Y.S.2d 26 (3d Dept 1998), appeal dismissed, leave to appeal denied 92 N.Y.2d 1041, 685 N.Y.S.2d 416 (1999); Betancourt v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1497, 49 N.Y.S.3d 315 (3d Dept. 2017); Bush v Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017); Perea v Stanford, 149 A.D.3d 1392, 53 N.Y.S.3d 231 (3d Dept. 2017); Mays v Stanford, 150 A.D.3d 1521, 55 N.Y.S.3d 502 (3d Dept. 2017); Gonzalvo v Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); Paniagua v Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1018, 56 N.Y.S.3d 894 (3d Dept. 2017); Lewis v Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1478, 59 N.Y.S.3d 726 (3d Dept. 2017); Cobb v Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1500, 59 N.Y.S.3d 915 (3d Dept. 2017); Franza v Stanford, 155 A.D.3d 1291, 65 N.Y.S.3d 252 (3d Dept. 2017); Constant v Stanford, 157 A.D.3d 1175, 67 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2018); Robinson v New York State Board of Parole, 162 A.D.3d 1450, 81 N.Y.S.3d 235 (3d Dept. 2018).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

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

The Board stressing the nature of the underlying offense, troubling criminal history and prison disciplinary record, does not constitute irrationality bordering on impropriety. Perez v Evans, 76 A.D.3d 1130, 907 N.Y.S.2d 701 (3d Dept. 2010); Mentor v New York State Division of Parole, 87 A.D.3d 1245, 930 N.Y.S.2d 302 (3d Dept. 2011) lv.app.den. 18 N.Y.3d 803, 938 N.Y.S.2d 860 (2012); Stanley v New York State Division of Parole, 92 A.D.3d 948, 939 N.Y.S.2d 132 (2d Dept. 2012); Moore v New York State Board of Parole, 137 A.D.3d 1375, 26 N.Y.S.3d 412 (3d Dept. 2016).

The Board may consider the inmates minimizing of their role in the crime. Serrano v New York State Executive Department-Division of Parole, 261 A.D.2d 163, 689 N.Y.S.2d 504, 505 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept 1999). The Board is empowered to deny parole where it concludes release is incompatible with the welfare of society. Thus, there is a strong rehabilitative component in the statute that may be given effect by considering lack of insight. Silmon v Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704, 708 (2000). The Board may consider the lack of insight. Crawford v New York State Board of Parole, 144 A.D.3d 1308, 46 N.Y.S.3d 228 (3d Dept. 2016).

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

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

There are no substantial evidence issues in a Parole Board Release Interview. Valderrama v Travis, 19 A.D.3d 904, 905, 796 N.Y.S.2d 758 (3d Dept. 2005); Tatta v Dennison, 26 A.D.3d 663, 809 N.Y.S.2d 296 (3d Dept. 2006) lv.den. 6 N.Y.3d 714, 816 N.Y.S.2d 750; Harris v New York State Division of Parole, 211 A.D.2d 205, 628 N.Y.S.2d 416 (3d Dept. 1995). A substantial evidence issue arises only where a quasi-judicial hearing has been held and evidence has been taken pursuant to law. If no hearing was held, the issue does not arise. Horace v Annucci, 133 A.D.3d 1263, 20 N.Y.S.3d 492 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2015). A proceeding to determine whether an inmate should be released on parole is not a quasi-judicial hearing. Banks v Stanford, 159 A.D.3d 134, 71 N.Y.S.3d 515 (2d Dept. 2018).

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). 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).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

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

Appellant's second claim is she was prejudiced by not being allowed to view the entire contents of her Board of Parole file.

In response, an inmate has no constitutional right to the information in her parole file. Billiteri v U.S. Board of Parole, 541 F.2d 938, 944-945 (2d Cir. 1976). Molinar v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1214, 991 N.Y.S.2d 487 (3d Dept. 2014). An inmate does not have automatic access to confidential material. Matter of Perez v New York State Division of Parole, 294 A.D.2d 726, 741 N.Y.S.2d 753 (3d Dept 2002); Macklin v Travis, 274 A.D.2d 821, 711 N.Y.S.2d 915, 916 (3d Dept. 2000). Per Executive Law 259-i(2)(c)(B), items submitted to the Parole Board are deemed to be confidential. Per Executive Law 259-k(2) and 9 N.Y.C.R.R. 8000.5(c)(2)(i)(a)(b), the Parole Board is entitled to designate certain parole records as confidential. Wade v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017); Justice v Commissioner of the New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 130 A.D.3d 1342, 15 N.Y.S.3d 853 (3d Dept. 2015).

Appellant's third claim is the Board relied upon erroneous information. Specifically, her answer to a question about the child's mother doesn't mean she was blame shifting.

In response, appellant's answers, such as "I ask myself that every day," clearly shift some blame. The Board decision merely said the Board is "concerned." A Board decision reciting the inmate's answer pertains to its interpretation of the circumstances of the crime and does not mean the Board considered erroneous information. Martinez v Evans 108 A.D.3d 815, 968 N.Y.S.2d 258 (3d Dept. 2013). A Parole Board Commissioner stating he found the inmate's explanation difficult to fathom does not amount to a misunderstanding of the facts of the crime or of improper factors, as failing to accept responsibility is a factor within the scope of the statute. Hamilton v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014). There is no support in the record that the Board relied upon incorrect or erroneous information. Shark v New York State Division of Parole Chair, 110 A.D.3d 1134, 972 N.Y.S.2d 741 (3d Dept. 2013); Khatib v New York State Board of Parole, 118 A.D.3d 1207, 988 N.Y.S.2d 286 (3d Dept. 2014); Boccadisi v Stanford, 133 A.D.3d 1169, 20 N.Y.S.3d 477 (3d Dept. 2015); Peterson v Stanford, 151 A.D.3d 1960, 59 N.Y.S.3d 219 (4<sup>th</sup> Dept. 2017).



STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

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

Appellant's final claim is the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law in that the COMPAS is an evidence based instrument, and it was ignored.

In response, appellant's claim 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); Boccadisi v Stanford, 133 A.D.3d 1169, 20 N.Y.S.3d 477 (3d Dept. 2015). Furthermore, the 2011 amendments have been incorporated into the 2017 Board regulations.

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 Board did consider the COMPAS, which was mixed, in that she was a medium risk on history of violence, which is relevant to her risk of re-offense given that she had killed someone. Bush v Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017). 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). In any event, 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).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

**STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Inmate Name:** Rood, Geneia

**Facility:** Albion Correctional Facility

**Dept. DIN#:** 14G0218

**Appeal Control #:** 07-159-18-B

**Findings:** (continued from page 7)

Notably, the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law did not change the three substantive standards that the Board is required to apply when deciding whether to grant parole, namely (1) whether “there is a reasonable probability that, if such inmate is released, she will live and remain at liberty without violating the law”; (2) whether release “is not incompatible with the welfare of society”; and (3) whether release “will not so deprecate the seriousness of his crime as to undermine respect for law.” See Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A). Even uniformly low COMPAS scores and other evidence of rehabilitation would not resolve the broader questions of society’s welfare, public perceptions of the seriousness of a crime, or whether release would undermine respect for the law. Thus the COMPAS cannot mandate a particular result, and declining to afford the COMPAS controlling weight does not violate the 2011 amendments. King v Stanford, 137 A.D.3d 1396, 26 N.Y.S.3d 815 (3d Dept. 2016); Furman v Annucci, 138 A.D.3d 1269, 28 N.Y.S.3d 352 (3d Dept. 2016). The COMPAS is an additional consideration that the Board must weigh along with the statutory factors for purposes of deciding whether the three standards are satisfied. Rivera v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1107, 1108, 990 N.Y.S.2d 295 (3d Dept. 2014); accord Dawes v Annucci, 122 A.D.3d 1059, 1061, 994 N.Y.S.2d 747 (3d Dept. 2014).

**Recommendation:**

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