

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 - Gordon, Joseph (2019-06-06)

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Gordon, Joseph (2019-06-06)" (2020). Parole Information Project  
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/242>

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**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**NYSID:** [REDACTED]

**Appeal  
Control No.:** 01-137-19 B

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

Appearances: Jeffrey Horowitz Esq.  
Arnold Porter Kaye Scholer LLP  
250 West 55th Street  
New York, New York 10019

Decision appealed: December 2018 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 18 months.


Board Member(s)  
who participated: Alexander, Berliner, Shapiro

Papers considered: Appellant's Brief received April 10, 2019


Appeals Unit Review: Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings and Recommendation

Records relied upon: Pre-Sentence Investigation Report, Parole Board Report, Interview Transcript, Parole Board Release Decision Notice (Form 9026), COMPAS instrument, Offender Case Plan.

Final Determination: The undersigned determine that the decision appealed is hereby:

  
Commissioner

☒ Affirmed ☐ Vacated, remanded for de novo interview ☐ Modified to \_\_\_\_\_

  
Commissioner

☒ Affirmed ☐ Vacated, remanded for de novo interview ☐ Modified to \_\_\_\_\_

  
Commissioner

☒ Affirmed ☐ Vacated, remanded 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 6/6/19 CC.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 1 of 7)

---

Appellant challenges the December 2018 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 18-month hold. The instant offense involved the appellant shooting the victim to death, and dumping the body elsewhere. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the decision is arbitrary and capricious in that the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the required statutory factors. 2) the Board penalized the appellant for maintaining his claim of innocence. 3) the Board failed to list facts in support of the statutory standard cited. 4) the decision lacked detail. 5) the decision was based upon penal philosophy. 6) concealing a corpse is not an escalation of his criminal history. 7) he was not evasive during the interview. 8) the decision illegally resentenced him. 9) community opposition and DA opposition are not allowed, and the FOIL request to obtain these documents was illegally denied. 10) the decision violated the due process clause of the constitution. 11) the COMPAS was ignored.

Discretionary release to parole is not to 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 the law.” Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A) (emphasis added); accord Matter of Hamilton v. New York State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014). Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A) requires the Board to consider criteria which is relevant to the specific inmate, including, but not limited to, the inmate’s institutional record and criminal behavior. People ex rel. Herbert v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881 (1st Dept. 1983). While consideration of these factors is mandatory, “the ultimate decision to parole a prisoner is discretionary.” Matter of Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 477, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704, 708 (2000). Thus, it is well settled that the weight to be accorded the requisite factors is solely within the Board’s discretion. See, e.g., Matter of Delacruz v. Annucci, 122 A.D.3d 1413, 997 N.Y.S.2d 872 (4th Dept. 2014); Matter of Hamilton, 119 A.D.3d at 1271, 990 N.Y.S.2d at 717; Matter of Garcia v. New York State Div. of Parole, 239 A.D.2d 235, 239, 657 N.Y.S.2d 415, 418 (1st Dept. 1997). The Board need not explicitly refer to each factor in its decision, nor give them equal weight. Matter of Betancourt v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1497, 49 N.Y.S.3d 315 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of LeGeros v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 139 A.D.3d 1068, 30 N.Y.S.3d 834 (2d Dept. 2016); Matter of Phillips v. Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 21, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121, 124 (1st Dept. 2007).

Although the Board placed emphasis on the crime (murder), the record reflects it also considered other appropriate factors and it was not required to place equal weight on each factor considered. Matter of Peralta v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 157 A.D.3d 1151, 69 N.Y.S.3d 885 (3d Dept. 2018); Matter of Arena v. New York State Dep’t of Corr. & Cmty. Supervision, 156 A.D.3d 1101, 65 N.Y.S.3d 471 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Gordon v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1502,

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 2 of 7)

---

50 N.Y.S.3d 627 (3d Dept. 2017).

The Board may emphasize the nature of the instant offense and that it was an escalation in illegal behavior. See Matter of Stanley v. New York State Div. of Parole, 92 A.D.3d 948, 948-49, 939 N.Y.S.2d 132, 134 (2d Dept.), lv. denied, 19 N.Y.3d 806, 949 N.Y.S.2d 343 (2012); Matter of Symmonds v. Dennison, 21 A.D.3d 1171, 1172, 801 N.Y.S.2d 90, 90 (3d Dept.), lv. denied, 6 N.Y.3d 701, 810 N.Y.S.2d 415 (2005); Matter of Warren v. New York State Div. of Parole, 307 A.D.2d 493, 493, 761 N.Y.S.2d 883 (3d Dept. 2003); Matter of Garcia v. New York State Div. of Parole, 239 A.D.2d 235, 239-40, 657 N.Y.S.2d 415, 418 (1st Dept. 1997).

The fact that the Board afforded greater weight to the inmate's criminal history, as opposed to other positive factors, does not render the denial of parole for that reason irrational or improper. Matter of Davis v. Evans, 105 A.D.3d 1305, 963 N.Y.S.2d 485 (3d Dept. 2013); Matter of Lashway v. Evans, 110 A.D.3d 1417, 1418, 974 N.Y.S.2d 164, 165 (3d Dept. 2013); Matter of McKee v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 157 A.D.2d 944, 550 N.Y.S.2d 204 (3d Dept. 1990).

The Board may consider a district attorney's recommendation to deny parole. Matter of Applegate v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 164 A.D.3d 996, 997, 82 N.Y.S.3d 240 (3d Dept. 2018); Matter of Porter v. Alexander, 63 A.D.3d 945, 881 N.Y.S.2d 157 (2d Dept. 2009); Matter of Walker v. Travis, 252 A.D.2d 360, 676 N.Y.S.2d 52 (1st Dept. 1998); Matter of Walker v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 218 A.D.2d 891, 630 N.Y.S.2d 417 (3d Dept. 1995); Matter of Williams v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 220 A.D.2d 753, 633 N.Y.S.2d 182 (2d Dept. 1995); Matter of Confoy v. New York State Div. of Parole, 173 A.D.2d 1014, 569 N.Y.S.2d 846, 847 (3d Dept. 1991); Matter of Lynch v. New York State Div. of Parole, 82 A.D.2d 1012, 442 N.Y.S.2d 179 (3d Dept. 1981).

Credibility of an inmates explanation is to be made by the Board. The Board may consider the inmate's capacity to tell the truth, and how this impacts on the statutory factors. Siao-Pao v. Dennison, 51 A.D.3d 105, 854 N.Y.S.2d 348 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 2008). Several of appellant's answers to questions were short or evasive.

The Board may consider the probable repercussions of the criminal's actions upon the victims' families. Bottom v New York State Board of Parole, 30 A.D.3d 657, 815 N.Y.S.2d 789 (3d Dept. 2006).

Once an individual has been convicted of a crime, it is generally not the Board's role to reevaluate a claim of innocence. Matter of Silmon v Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704, 708 (2000); Copeland v New York State Board of Parole, 154 A.D.3d 1157, 63 N.Y.S.3d 548 (3d Dept. 2017). But the Board did not punish the inmate for this claim.

The escalation of criminal history referred to the murder conviction, so it was not in error.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 3 of 7)

---

That the Board “did not recite the precise statutory language of Executive Law § 259-i (2)(c)(A) in support of its conclusion to deny parole would not undermine its conclusion.” Matter of Mullins v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 136 A.D.3d 1141, 1142, 25 N.Y.S.3d 698 (3d Dept. 2016) (citation omitted); accord Matter of Reed v. Evans, 94 A.D.3d 1323, 942 N.Y.S.2d 387 (3d Dept. 2012). The language used by the Board was “only semantically different” from the statute. Matter of Miller v. New York State Div. of Parole, 72 A.D.3d 690, 691–92, 897 N.Y.S.2d 726, 727 (2d Dept. 2010); Matter of James v. Chairman of New York State Div. of Parole, 19 A.D.3d 857, 858, 796 N.Y.S.2d 735, 736 (3d Dept. 2005); see also People ex rel. Herbert v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881 (1st Dept. 1983) (upholding decision that denied release as “contrary to the best interest of the community”).

The Board’s decision satisfied the criteria set out in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a), as it was sufficiently detailed to inform the inmate of the reasons for the denial of parole. Matter of Applegate v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 164 A.D.3d 996, 997, 82 N.Y.S.3d 240 (3d Dept. 2018); Matter of Kozlowski v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 108 A.D.3d 435, 968 N.Y.S.2d 87 (1st Dept. 2013); Matter of Little v. Travis, 15 A.D.3d 698, 788 N.Y.S.2d 628 (3d Dept. 2005); Matter of Davis v. Travis, 292 A.D.2d 742, 739 N.Y.S.2d 300 (3d Dept. 2002); People ex rel. Herbert v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881 (1st Dept. 1983).

Appellant’s assertion that the denial of parole release amounted to an improper resentencing is without merit inasmuch as the Board fulfilled its obligation to determine the propriety of release per Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A) and after considering the factors set forth therein. Executive Law § 259 et seq.; Penal Law § 70.40; Matter of Murray v. Evans, 83 A.D.3d 1320, 920 N.Y.S.2d 745 (3d Dept. 2011); Matter of Crews v. New York State Exec. Dept. Bd. of Parole Appeals Unit, 281 A.D.2d 672, 720 N.Y.S.2d 855 (3d Dept. 2001). The Board was vested with discretion to determine whether release was appropriate notwithstanding the minimum period of incarceration set by the Court. Matter of Burress v. Dennison, 37 A.D.3d 930, 829 N.Y.S.2d 283 (3d Dept. 2007); Matter of Cody v. Dennison, 33 A.D.3d 1141, 1142, 822 N.Y.S.2d 677 (3d Dept. 2006), lv. denied, 8 N.Y.3d 802, 830 N.Y.S.2d 698 (2007). The appellant has not in any manner been resentenced. Matter of Mullins v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 136 A.D.3d 1141, 1142, 25 N.Y.S.3d 698 (3d Dept. 2016).

The Board is not required to give the COMPAS and case plan greater weight than the other statutory factors. Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); accord Matter of Lewis v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1478, 59 N.Y.S.3d 726 (3d Dept. 2017). The 2011 amendments 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, he 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

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 4 of 7)

---

deprecate the seriousness of his crime as to undermine respect for law.” 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. Matter of King v. Stanford, 137 A.D.3d 1396, 26 N.Y.S.3d 815 (3d Dept. 2016). The COMPAS is an additional consideration that the Board must weigh along with the statutory factors for the purposes of deciding whether the three standards are satisfied. See Matter of Rivera v. N.Y. State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1107, 1108, 990 N.Y.S.2d 295 (3d Dept. 2014); accord Matter of Dawes v. Annucci, 122 A.D.3d 1059, 994 N.Y.S.2d 747 (3d Dept. 2014).

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). Denial is neither arbitrary nor capricious when the Board relies on factors defined by New York statute. Siao-Paul v. Connolly, 564 F. Supp. 2d 232, 242 (S.D.N.Y. 2008); Hanna v New York State Board of Parole, 169 A.D.3d 503, 92 N.Y.S.3d 621 (1<sup>st</sup> Dept. 2019).

In the absence of a convincing demonstration that the Board did not consider the statutory factors, it must be presumed that the Board fulfilled its duty. Matter of Fuchino v. Herbert, 255 A.D.2d 914, 914, 680 N.Y.S.2d 389, 390 (4th Dept. 1998); Matter of McLain v. New York State Div. of Parole, 204 A.D.2d 456, 611 N.Y.S.2d 629 (2d Dept. 1994); Matter of McKee v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 157 A.D.2d 944, 945, 550 N.Y.S.2d 204, 205 (3d Dept. 1990); People ex rel. Herbert, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881.

Community opposition was not cited as a factor in the Board decision, though DA opposition was. As appellant made his request through FOIL, that is a matter that is outside the scope of the jurisdiction of the Appeals Unit. In any event, an inmate has no constitutional right to the information in his parole file, including the pre-sentence investigation report and the confidential section of the Parole Board report. Billiteri v U.S. Board of Parole, 541 F.2d 938, 944-945 (2d Cir. 1976). 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). The Board may consider the confidential section to the Inmate Status Report/Parole Board Report is permissible. Molinar v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1214, 991 N.Y.S.2d 487 (3d Dept. 2014). Per Executive Law 259-i(2)(c)(B), items submitted to the Parole Board are deemed to be

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 5 of 7)

---

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).

Pursuant to Executive Law §259-k and 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §8000.5 et. seq., parole records are deemed to be confidential. Thus, per Public Officers Law §87(2)(b) they are exempt from disclosure on the grounds on confidentiality, invasion of privacy, and the possibility they could endanger the life and safety of a person-even if redacted. Zarvela v New York State Division of Parole, 252 A.D.2d 714, 675 N.Y.S.2d 917 (3d Dept. 1998); Collins v New York State Division of Parole, 251 A.D.2d 738, 674 A.D.2d 145 (3d Dept. 1998), lv. den. 92 N.Y.2d 811, 680 N.Y.S.2d 457; Robles v Tracy, 275 A.D.2d 837, 713 N.Y.S.2d 777 (3d Dept. 2000); Carty v New York State Division of Parole, 277 A.D.2d 633, 716 N.Y.S.2d 125, 126 (3d Dept. 2000). An inmate has no right to the letter from the District Attorney to the Parole Board, and it falls within a FOIL exemption from disclosure. Grigger v New York State Division of Parole, 11 A.D.3d 850, 783 N.Y.S.2d 689 (3d Dept. 2004); Matter of Ramahlo v Bruno, 273 A.D.2d 521, 708 N.Y.S.2d 206 (3d Dept. 2000) lv. den. 95 N.Y.2d 767 (2000); Mingo v New York State Division of Parole, 244 A.D.2d 781, 666 N.Y.S.2d 245 (3d Dept. 1997).

As for community opposition, the Board may receive and consider written communications from individuals, other than those specifically identified in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A), opposing an inmate's release to parole supervision. Matter of Applewhite v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 167 A.D.3d 1380, 91 N.Y.S.3d 308, 311 (3d Dept. 2018) ("Contrary to petitioner's contention, we do not find that [the Board's] consideration of certain unspecified 'consistent community opposition' to his parole release was outside the scope of the relevant statutory factors that may be taken into account in rendering a parole release determination"), appeal dismissed, 2019 N.Y. LEXIS 622 (Mar. 28, 2019); Matter of Clark v. New York Bd. of Parole, 166 A.D.3d 531, 89 N.Y.S.3d 134 (1st Dept. 2018) ("the Board permissibly considered letters in opposition to the parole application submitted by public officials and members of the community"); Matter of Grigger v. New York State Div. of Parole, 11 A.D.3d 850, 852–53, 783 N.Y.S.2d 689, 691 (3d Dept. 2004) (recognizing 259-i(2)(c)(A)(v)'s list is not the exclusive information the Board may consider and persons in addition to victims and their families may submit letters), lv. denied, 4 N.Y.3d 704, 792 N.Y.S.2d 1 (2005); see also Matter of Jordan v. Hammock, 86 A.D.2d 725, 447 N.Y.S.2d 44 (3d Dept. 1982) (letters from private citizens are protected and remain confidential); Matter of Rivera v. Evans, Index No. 0603-16, *Decision & Order* dated July 5, 2016 (Sup. Ct. Sullivan Co.)(LaBuda A.J.S.C.) (recognizing "[c]onsideration of community or other opposition was proper under the statute" and the Board is required to keep identity of persons opposing release confidential), aff'd sub nom. Matter of Rivera v. Stanford, 53 N.Y.S.3d 404, 149 A.D.3d 1445 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Hamilton v. New York State Bd. of Parole, Index # 3699-2013, *Order and Judgment* dated October 25, 2013 (Devine J.S.C.)(Albany Co. Court)(no showing of prejudice by allegedly false

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 6 of 7)

---

information in PBA online petition where Board acknowledged public opposition during interview), aff'd, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014); cf. Krebs v. N.Y. State Div. of Parole, No. 9:08-CV-255NAMDEP, 2009 WL 2567779, at \*12 (N.D.N.Y. Aug. 17, 2009) (public and political pressure “are permissible factors which parole officials may properly consider as they relate to ‘whether ‘release is not incompatible with the welfare of society and will not so deprecate the seriousness of the offense as to undermine respect for the law’”); Morel v. Thomas, No. 02 CV 9622 (HB), 2003 WL 21488017, at \*5 (S.D.N.Y. June 26, 2003) (same); Seltzer v. Thomas, No. 03 CIV.00931 LTS FM, 2003 WL 21744084, at \*4 (S.D.N.Y. July 29, 2003) (same). The same has also long been recognized as true with respect to letters supporting an inmate’s potential parole release. See, e.g., Matter of Hamilton v. New York State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d at 1273, 990 N.Y.S.2d at 719 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Gaston v. Barbary, 16 A.D.3d 1158, 1159, 791 N.Y.S.2d 781, 782 (4th Dept. 2005); Matter of Torres v. New York State Div. of Parole, 300 A.D.2d 128, 129, 750 N.Y.S.2d 759, 760 (1st Dept. 2002); Matter of Walker v. Travis, 252 A.D.2d 360, 362, 676 N.Y.S.2d 52, 54 (1st Dept. 1998); cf. Cardenales v. Dennison, 37 A.D.3d 371, 371, 830 N.Y.S.2d 152, 153 (1st Dept. 2007) (Board permissibly determined offense outweighed other positive factors including letters of support from, among others, victim’s mother). Indeed, 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8000.5(c)(2) refers to the security of letters either in support of or in opposition to an inmate’s release.

Mention should also be made that the policy being urged by appellant would be unconstitutional. It is a binding principle that New York courts must avoid, if possible, interpreting a presumptively valid statute in such a manner that would needlessly render it to be unconstitutional. Alliance of American Insurers v Chu, 77 N.Y.2d 573, 585, 569 N.Y.S.364 (1991); Lavalle v Hayden, 98 N.Y.2d 155, 161, 746 N.Y.S.2d 125 (2002). Per the First Amendment, “Congress shall make no law ... prohibiting the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.” The right of petition found in the First Amendment is one of the freedoms protected by the Bills of Rights, and the courts cannot impute to the Legislature an intent to invade these freedoms. This philosophy governs the approach of groups of citizens to administrative agencies (which are both creatures of the legislature, and arms of the executive). Certainly the right to petition extends to all departments of the government. Calififornia Motor Transport Co. v Trucking Unlimited, 404 U.S. 508, 510, 92 S.Ct. 609, 30 L.Ed2d 642 (1972). The courts should refrain from adopting such an unconstitutional interpretation. If the Appeals Unit were to adopt the approach advocated by appellant, it is basically rendering the First Amendment as being meaningless by ordering the Parole Board not to entertain constitutionally authorized activity.

The Parole Board decision doesn’t contain any penal law philosophy. And, by way of analogy, victim impact statements may contain raw emotions of a close-knit family traumatized by a depraved and senseless murder. These submissions can also be emotional and touch upon



STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Gordon, Joseph

**DIN:** 93-A-2215

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 01-137-19 B

**Findings:** (Page 7 of 7)

---

inappropriate matters. Such fact does not require the Parole Board to expressly disavow in its decision inappropriate matters interjected by victims or to somehow quantify the extent or degree to which it considered appropriate parts of victim's statements while disregarding other parts in its overall analysis of the statutory factors. The Board's decision will be upheld if there is nothing indicating it was influenced by, placed weigh upon, or relied upon any improper matter. Duffy v New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 132 A.D.3d 1207, 19 N.Y.S.3d 610 (3d Dept. 2015).

An inmate has no Constitutional right to be conditionally released on parole before expiration of a valid sentence. Greenholtz v. Inmates of Nebraska Penal & Correctional Complex, 442 U.S. 1, 99 S. Ct. 2100, 2104 (1979); Matter of Russo v. Bd. of Parole, 50 N.Y.2d 69, 427 N.Y.S.2d 982 (1980); Matter of Vineski v. Travis, 244 A.D.2d 737, 664 N.Y.S.2d 391 (3d Dept. 1997). The New York State parole scheme "holds out no more than a possibility of parole" and thus does not create a protected liberty interest implicating the due process clause. Matter of Russo, 50 N.Y.2d at 75-76, 427 N.Y.S.2d at 985; see also Barna v. Travis, 239 F.3d 169, 171 (2d Cir. 2001); Matter of Freeman v. New York State Div. of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1174, 800 N.Y.S.2d 797 (3d Dept. 2005). That the inmate has served his minimum sentence does not give him a protected liberty interest in parole release. Matter of Russo v. Bd. of Parole, 50 N.Y.2d 69, 427 N.Y.S.2d 982 (1980); Matter of Motti v. Alexander, 54 A.D.3d 114, 115, 863 N.Y.S.2d 839, 839-40 (3d Dept. 2008); Matter of Warren v. New York State Div. of Parole, 307 A.D.2d 493, 493, 761 N.Y.S.2d 883, 883 (3d Dept. 2003); Matter of Vineski v. Travis, 244 A.D.2d 737, 664 N.Y.S.2d 391 (3d Dept. 1997).

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).

**Recommendation:** Affirm.