

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 - Dean, Karl (2019-06-06)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Dean, Karl (2019-06-06)" (2020). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/253>

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.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Dean, Karl

Facility: Fishkill CF

NYSID: [REDACTED]

**Appeal
Control No.:** 10-193-18 B

DIN: 78-A-1566

Appearances: Karl Dean (78A1566)
Fishkill Correctional Facility
271 Matteawan Road, Box 1245
Beacon, New York 12508

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

Board Member(s)
who participated: Crangle, Berliner, Davis


Papers considered: Appellant's Brief received April 3, 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: Dean, Karl

DIN: 78-A-1566

Facility: Fishkill CF

AC No.: 10-193-18 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 4)

Appellant challenges the October 2018 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 18-month hold.

Appellant's five felony convictions are as follows: (1) Murder 1st; (2) Criminal Sale of a Controlled Substance 3rd; (3) Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance 3rd; (4) Criminal Possession of a Controlled Substance 5th; (5) Attempted Criminal Possession of a Weapon 3rd. Appellant is serving an aggregate term of imprisonment of 25 years to life for these crimes. Appellant shot and killed a police officer with a shotgun, and shot and killed a man he had an argument with. Thirty-four grams of cocaine were recovered from Appellant when he was arrested.

Appellant raises the following issues in his brief: (1) the Board's decision was arbitrary and capricious, made in violation of applicable legal authority, and lacked sufficient detail; (2) certain COMPAS scores and release plans were not given sufficient consideration by the Board; (3) certain issues were not discussed in sufficient detail during the interview; and (4) the Board should not have considered community opposition letters.

As to the first and second issues, 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). "Although these standards are no longer repeated in the [Board's] regulation, this in no way modifies the statutory mandate requiring their application." Notice of Adoption, NY Reg, Sept. 27, 2017 at 2. A conclusion that an inmate fails to satisfy **any one** of the considerations set forth in Executive Law §259-i(2)(c)(A) is an independent basis to deny parole. See, e.g., Matter of Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 477, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704, 708 (2000); Matter of Robles v. Fischer, 117 A.D.3d 1558, 1559, 985 N.Y.S.2d 386 (4th Dept. 2014); Matter of Hamilton v. New York State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268; Matter of Phillips v. Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 21, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121, 124 (1st Dept. 2007).

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. Thus, it is well settled that the weight to be accorded the requisite factors is solely within the Board's discretion. See,

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Dean, Karl

DIN: 78-A-1566

Facility: Fishkill CF

AC No.: 10-193-18 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 4)

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; 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. 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.

In 2011, the law was amended to require procedures incorporating risk and needs principles to “assist” the Board in making parole release decisions. Executive Law § 259–c(4); 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §8002.2(a). The Board satisfies this requirement in part by using the COMPAS instrument. Matter of Montane v. Evans, 116 A.D.3d 197, 202, 981 N.Y.S.2d 866, 870 (3d Dept. 2014); see also Matter of Hawthorne v. Stanford, 135 A.D.3d 1036, 1042, 22 N.Y.S.3d 640, 645 (3d Dept. 2016); 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 Robles v. Fischer, 117 A.D.3d 1558, 1559, 985 N.Y.S.2d 386, 387 (4th Dept. 2014). Notably, the 2011 amendments did not eliminate the requirement that the Board conduct a case-by-case review of each inmate by considering the statutory factors including the instant offense. The amendments also did not change the three substantive standards that the Board is required to apply when deciding whether to grant parole. See Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A). Thus, the COMPAS instrument cannot mandate a particular result. Matter of King v. Stanford, 137 A.D.3d 1396, 26 N.Y.S.3d 815 (3d Dept. 2016). Rather, 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); see also Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017). Furthermore, 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).

In response to the third issue, the Board’s decision satisfied the criteria set out in Executive Law §259-i(2)(a) and 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §8002.3(d), 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

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Dean, Karl

DIN: 78-A-1566

Facility: Fishkill CF

AC No.: 10-193-18 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 4)

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).

In response to the fourth issue, 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 (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"); 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 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. Berbarry, 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

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Dean, Karl

DIN: 78-A-1566

Facility: Fishkill CF

AC No.: 10-193-18 B

Findings: (Page 4 of 4)

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.; Matter of Costello v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 101 A.D.3d 1512, 957 N.Y.S.2d 486 (3d Dept. 2012) (indicating Board considered Police Commissioner's letter of opposition in original determination to grant open date), rev'd on other grounds 23 N.Y.3d 1002, 1004, 994 N.Y.S.2d 39 (2014); Matter of LaBarbera v. New York State Div. of Parole, Index No. 12711/18, Decision/Order of Jan. 17, 2019 (Sup. Ct. Columbia Co.) (Mott, J.S.C.) (Board properly considered community opposition); Matter of Bottom v. Dep't of Corr. & Cmty. Supervision, Index No. 902448-17, *Judgment* dated Jan. 10, 2018 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co.) (DeBow A.S.C.J.) (rejecting challenge to Board's reliance on community opposition where majority of submissions addressed matters permitted by Executive Law and [per Duffy] there was no indication Board was influenced by improper objections predicated solely on victims' police officer status); Matter of Bottom v. Dep't of Corr. & Cmty. Supervision, Index No. 902448-17, *Decision & Order* dated Nov. 2, 2017 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co.) (DeBow A.S.C.J.) (recognizing Board may consider letters from private citizens while non-individualized objections based on class of crime would be improper); Matter of Comfort v. New York State Bd. of Parole, Index No. 3299-17, *Decision & Order* dated Oct. 27, 2017 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co.) (Kowick A.S.C.J.) (rejecting challenge to community opposition and speculative allegation that Board considered erroneous information therein); Matter of Hayes v. New York State Bd. of Parole, Index No. 200-2017, *Decision & Order* dated May 3, 2017 (Sup. Ct. Sullivan) (Schick J.S.C.) (rejecting challenge to Board decision based on reliance on community opposition including by PBA); Matter of Reyes v. Stanford, Index No. 1674/2017, *Decision, Order & Judgment* dated Sept. 21, 2017 (Supt. Ct. Dutchess Co.) (Forman A.S.C.J.) (concluding community opposition is an appropriate factor the Board may consider **but** treated as harmless misstatement); Matter of Bailey v. New York State Div. of Parole, Index No. 973-16, *Decision & Judgment* dated Aug. 17, 2016 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co.) (Hartman A.J.S.C.) (rejecting challenge to Board decision based on reliance on letters generated by police officers' union [even assuming letters contained inaccuracies or were inflammatory, Board would be permitted to consider them for what they were worthy per Duffy and will be presumed not to have relied on inappropriate matters therein unless decision indicates otherwise]); Matter of Gordon v. Stanford, Index No. 788-16, *Decision & Order* dated June 17, 2016 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co.) (McGrath J.S.C.) (finding no error in Board's consideration of community opposition, which was mentioned during interview), aff'd on other grounds Matter of Gordon v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1502, 50 N.Y.S.3d 627 (3d Dept. 2017) (remaining claims unpreserved for review).

Recommendation: Affirm.