### 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 - Gomez, Santiago (2019-03-08)

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

#### **Recommended Citation**

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Gomez, Santiago (2019-03-08)" (2020). Parole Information Project https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/407

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: Gomez, Santia	ago Facility: Westchester Co. Jail
NYSID	Appeal Control No.: 07-129-18R
<b>DIN:</b> 13A2110	
Appearances:	Gerald Zuckerman, Esq. P.O. Box 392 Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520
Decision appealed:	July 11, 2018 revocation of release and imposition of a time assessment of 15-months.
Final Revocation Hearing Date:	July 11, 2018
Papers considered:	Appellant's Brief received December 27, 2018
Appeals Unit Review:	Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings and Recommendation
Records relied upon:	Notice of Violation, Violation of Release Report, Final Hearing Transcript, Parole Revocation Decision Notice
Einal Determination:	The undersigned determine that the decision appealed is hereby:
Commissioner	Affirmed Reversed, remanded for de novo hearing Reversed, violation vacated Vacated for de novo review of time assessment only Modified to
	✓ Affirmed Reversed, remanded for de novo hearing Reversed, violation vacated  Vacated for de novo review of time assessment only Modified to
Contrassioner	
Commissioner	Vacated for de novo review of time assessment only Modified to
If the Final Determination is at variance with Findings and Recommendation of Appeals Unit, written reasons for the Parole Board's determination <u>must</u> 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 3/8/19 66.	

#### STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

## **APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

Name: Gomez, Santiago
Pacility: Westchester Co. Jail
AC No.: 07-129-18R

**Findings**: (Page 1 of 2)

Appellant challenges the determination of the administrative law judge ("ALJ"), revoking release and imposing a 15-month time assessment.

Appellant raises the following issues in his brief: (1) the guilty plea was not voluntary; and (2) the time assessment was excessive.

A knowing and voluntary guilty plea establishes that the parolee violated parole in an important respect, and precludes a subsequent challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence. Matter of Harris v. Evans, 121 A.D.3d 1151, 993 N.Y.S.2d 790 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Steele v. New York State Div. of Parole, 123 A.D.3d 1170, 998 N.Y.S.2d 244 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Taylor v. NYS Division of Parole, 108 A.D.3d 953, 968 N.Y.S.2d 808, 809 (3d Dept. 2013); Matter of Holdip v. Travis, 9 A.D.3d 825, 779 N.Y.S.2d 382 (4th Dept. 2004); Matter of Fuller v. Goord, 299 A.D.2d 849, 849, 749 N.Y.S.2d 628, 629 (4th Dept. 2002), Iv. denied, 100 N.Y.2d 531, 761 N.Y.S.2d 592 (2003). A guilty plea standing alone is sufficient to support a finding of guilt and it is not required the inmate admit it was a violation in an important respect. Matter of Horace v. Annucci, 133 A.D.3d 1263, 20 N.Y.S.3d 492 (4th Dept. 2015).

Appellant's parole was revoked at the hearing upon his unconditional plea of guilty. Appellant was represented by counsel at the final hearing, and the Administrative Law Judge explained the substance of the plea agreement. The guilty plea was entered into knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily, and is therefore valid. Matter of Steele v. New York State Div. of Parole, 123 A.D.3d 1170, 998 N.Y.S.2d 244 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of James v. Chairman of N.Y. State Bd. of Parole, 106 A.D.3d 1300, 965 N.Y.S.2d 235 (3d Dept. 2013); Matter of Ramos v. New York State Div. of Parole, 300 A.D.2d 852, 853, 752 N.Y.S.2d 159 (3d Dept. 2002). Consequently, his guilty plea forecloses this challenge. See Matter of Steele, 123 A.D.3d 1170, 998 N.Y.S.2d 244; Matter of Gonzalez v. Artus, 107 A.D.3d 1568, 1569, 966 N.Y.S.2d 710, 711 (4th Dept. 2013).

Appellant is a Category 1 violator and, therefore, the ALJ must impose a minimum time assessment of 15 months, or a hold to the maximum expiration date of Appellant's sentence, whichever is less. The ALJ may in certain cases reduce the minimum 15-month time assessment by up to three months, but this was not part of the stipulated settlement made on the record at the final revocation hearing. See 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §8005.20(c)(1). The 15-month time assessment imposed by the ALJ at the final revocation hearing was agreed to on the record by both Appellant and his attorney without objection, and was not excessive as the Executive Law does not place an outer limit on the length of the time assessment that may be imposed. Matter of Washington v. Annucci, 144 A.D.3d 1541, 41 N.Y.S.3d 808 (4th Dept. 2016); Matter of Wilson v. Evans, 104

### STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

## **APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

Name: Gomez, Santiago

Facility: Westchester Co. Jail

AC No.: 07-129-18R

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

\_\_\_\_\_

A.D.3d 1190, 1191, 960 N.Y.S.2d 807, 809 (4th Dept. 2013); <u>Murchison v. New York State Div.</u> of Parole, 91 A.D.3d 1005, 1005, 935 N.Y.S.2d 741, 742 (3d Dept. 2012).

**Recommendation:** Affirm.