December 2020

Administrative Appeal Decision - Ocasio, Rafael (2018-12-28)

STATE OF NEW YORK– BOARD OF PAROLE

Administrative Appeal Decision Notice

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

NYSID No [redacted] **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033

Appearances:
For the Board, the Appeals Unit
For Appellant: Rebecca Fox Esq.
22 U.S. Oval
Suite 115
Plattsburgh, New York 12903

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

Decision appealed from: 6/2018-Denial of discretionary release, with imposition of 24 month hold.

Pleadings considered: Brief on behalf of the appellant received on October 5, 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 — ~~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 AA.

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: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings:

Counsel for the appellant has submitted a brief to serve as the perfected appeal. The brief raises three primary issues.

Appellant's first claim is the decision is arbitrary and capricious in that the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the required statutory factors. Appellant contends he 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 failed to make required findings of fact or to provide detail or offer future guidance, and illegally resentenced him. Appellant states the decision was also predetermined, in violation of the due process and equal protection clauses of the constitution.

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 (1st Dept. 1997); People ex rel. Herbert v. New York State Board of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881 (1st 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 (2nd Dept. 2016); Kenefick v Sticht, 139 A.D.3d 1380, 31 N.Y.S.3d 367 (4th 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 (4th Dept. 2014); Phillips v Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121 (1st 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: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 1)

The Board's emphasis on the serious nature of the crimes does not demonstrate a showing of irrationality bordering on impropriety. Philips v Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121 (1st Dept. 2007); Cardenales v Dennison, 26 A.D.3d 614, 810 N.Y.S.2d 233 (1st Dept. 2007); Berry v New York State Division of Parole, 64 A.D.3d 1030, 882 N.Y.S.2d 759 (3d Dept. 2008); Smith v New York State Division of Parole, 64 A.D.3d 1030, 882 N.Y.S.2d 759 (3d Dept. 2009); Robles v Dennison, 449 F.Appx. 51, 53-54 (2nd Cir. 2011); Hodge v Griffin, 2014 WL 2453333(SDNY 2014); Perea v Stanford, 149 A.D.3d 1392, 53 N.Y.S.3d 231 (3d Dept. 2017).

The fact that the appellant committed the instant offense while under probation supervision is also a basis for denying parole release. Geames v Travis, 284 A.D.2d 843, 726 N.Y.S.2d 506, 507 (3d Dept 2001); Herouard v Travis, 250 A.D.2d 911, 673 N.Y.S.2d 229, 230 (3d Dept 1998); De La Cruz v Travis, 10 A.D.3d 789, 781 N.Y.S.2d 798, 800 (3d Dept. 2004); Hunter v New York State Division of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1178, 800 N.Y.S.2d 799 (3d Dept 2005); Bush v Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017); Wade v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017); Cobb v Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1500, 59 N.Y.S.3d 915 (3d Dept. 2017).

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).

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 2)

Denial of parole due to a need to take more rehabilitative programming is appropriate. 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); People ex rel. Justice v Russi, 226 A.D.2d 821, 641 N.Y.S.2d 143, 144 (3d Dept 1996); Odom v Henderson, 57 A.D.2d 710, 395 N.Y.S.2d 533 (4th Dept 1977); Connelly v New York State Division of Parole, 286 A.D.2d 792, 729 N.Y.S.2d 808, 809 (3d Dept 2001), appeal dismissed 97 N.Y.2d 677, 738 N.Y.S.2d 291 (2001).

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).

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-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. Duemmel 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 Led2d 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. Duemmel 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: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 4)

As for equal protection, the inmate does not specify exactly what group or classification he has been placed into, or that any law is discriminatory on its face. He has not alleged any facts that can give rise to an equal protection claim (e.g. showing he has been treated differently than others). As such, the petition fails to state a cause of action. Anderson v Coughlin, 700 F.2d 37, 44 (2d Cir. 1982). Even if this is deemed to be a classification, plaintiff has certainly not alleged anything to suggest he is in a suspect class or has been treated invidiously. Nicholas v Tucker, 114 F.3d 17, 20-21 (2d Cir. 1997); Allen v Cuomo, 100 F.3d 253, 260 (2d Cir. 1996); Carbonell v Acrish, 154 F.Supp.2d 552, 561 (S.D.N.Y. 2001), as prisoners either in the aggregate, or by type of offense, are not a suspect class. As long as there is a rational basis for the distinction, it will be upheld. Graziano v Pataki, 689 F.3d 110 (2nd Cir. 2012). Determining the optimal time for parole release eligibility elicits multiple legislative classifications and groupings that are not subject to heightened judicial scrutiny, but rather only to a rational basis to further a legitimate State purpose. McGinnis v Royster, 410 U.S. 263, 93 S.Ct. 1055, 1059, 35 L.Ed2d 282 (1973). Additionally, the equal protection clause will not speculate as to what the primary government purpose might or might not be. One purpose alone is sufficient. (McGinnis, supra, p. 1063). The equal protection clause of the New York State Constitution is no more broad than that found in the U.S. Constitution. It covers the same things, and has co-ordinate commands. Dorsey v Stuyvesant Town Corp., 299 N.Y. 512, 530-532 (1949) cert. denied 339 U.S. 981, 70 S.Ct. 1019 (1950). An equal protection claim is without merit, as the decision has a rational relationship to the objectives of community safety and respect for the law. 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) denied 6 N.Y.3d 714, 816 N.Y.S.2d 750 (2006); DeFino v Travis, 18 A.D.3d 1079, 795 N.Y.S.2d 477 (3rd Dept. 2005); Williams v New York State Division of Parole, 70 A.D.3d 1106, 894 N.Y.S.2d 224 (3d Dept. 2010) lv.den. 14 N.Y.3d 709, 901 N.Y.S.2d 143; Santiago v Alexander, 80 A.D.3d 1105, 916 N.Y.S.2d 529 (3d Dept. 2011).

In order for an equal protection claim brought by a "class of one" to succeed, there must be proof of intentionally treating the inmate differently from others similarly situated and that there is no rational basis for the difference in treatment. Village of Willowbrook v Olech, 528 U.S. 562, 120 S.Ct. 1073, 1074, 145 L.Ed2d 1060 (2000); Giordano v City of New York, 274 F.3d 740, 751 (2d Cir. 2001); Webb v Travis, 26 A.D.3d 614, 810 N.Y.S.2d 233, lv.den. 7 N.Y.3d 709, 822 N.Y.S.2d 483 (3d Dept. 2006). No such proof exists in this case.

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 5)

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 (4th 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).

As for the required three part statutory standard, contrary to appellant's claim, the Board is not required to repeat the language of the statute verbatim. Rather, it need merely insure that sufficient facts are in the decision which comply with the standard-which it has clearly done in this case. The factors cited, which were appellant's serious instant offenses, one committed while on probation, prison disciplinary record, need for further programming, lack of insight, and poor COMPAS scores, show the required statutory findings were in fact made in this case. Language used in the decision which is only semantically different from the statutory language (e.g. continued incarceration serves the community standards) is permissible. James v Chairman of the New York State Division of Parole, 19 A.D.3d 857, 796 N.Y.S.2d 735 (3d Dept. 2005); Miller v New York State Division of Parole, 72 A.D.3d 690, 897 N.Y.S.2d 726 (2d Dept. 2010). Although the Board's determination could have been stated more artfully, this is insufficient to annul the decision. Ek v Travis, 20 A.D.3d 667, 798 N.Y.S.2d 199 (3d Dept 2005). The Board's failure to recite the precise statutory language of the first sentence in support of its conclusion to deny parole release does not undermine it's determination. Silvero v Dennison, 28 A.D.3d 859, 811 N.Y.S.2d 822 (3d Dept. 2006); Reed v Evans, 94 A.D.3d 1323, 942 N.Y.S.2d 387 (3d Dept. 2012); Mullins v New York State Board of Parole, 136 A.D.3d 1141, 25 N.Y.S.3d 698 (3d Dept. 2016).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 6)

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 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 (4th 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).

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: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 7)

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 (4th 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).

Appellant's second claim is the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law in that the statutes are now rehabilitation and present focused.

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).

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 7)

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). 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, 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 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. *Matter of King v Stanford*, No. 521324, 2016 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 1732 (3d Dep't Mar. 10, 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. *See Matter of Rivera v. N.Y. State Div. of Parole*, 119 A.D.3d 1107, 1108 (3d Dep't 2014); *accord Matter of Dawes v. Annucci*, 122 A.D.3d 1059, 1061 (3d Dep't 2014).

Appellant's final claim is that the 24 month hold is excessive.

In response, the Board's decision to hold the inmate for the maximum period of 24 months is within the Board's discretion and within its authority pursuant to Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a) and 9 NYCRR § 8002.3 (d). Abascal v New York State Board of Parole, 23 A.D.3d 740, 802 N.Y.S. 2d 803 (3d Dept. 2005); Matter of Sinopoli v. New York State Board of Parole, 189 A.D.2d 960, 592 N.Y.S.2d 831 (3d Dept. 1993); Matter of Ganci v. Hammock, 99 A.D.2d 546, 471 N.Y.S.2d 630 (2d Dept. 1984).

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Ocasio, Rafael **Facility:** Clinton Correctional Facility

Dept. DIN#: 96A0033 **Appeal Control #:** 07-004-18-B

Findings: (continued from page 8)

As such, appellant failed to demonstrate that the hold of 24 months was excessive. Hill v New York State Board of Parole, 130 A.D.3d 1130, 14 N.Y.S.3d 515 (3d Dept. 2015); 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); Matter of Madlock v. Russi, 195 A.D.2d 646, 600 N.Y.S.2d 283 (3d Dept. 1993); Confoy v New York State Division of Parole, 173 A.D.2d 1014, 569 N.Y.S.2d 846,848 (3d Dept 1991); Smith v New York State Division of Parole, 64 A.D.3d 1030, 882 N.Y.S.2d 759 (3d Dept. 2009); Smith v New York State Division of Parole, 81 A.D.3d 1026, 916 N.Y.S.2d 285 (3d Dept. 2011); Shark v New York State Division of Parole Chair, 110 A.D.3d 1134, 972 N.Y.S.2d 741 (3d Dept. 2013).

Recommendation:

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