

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 - Chavis, Shaeem (2019-02-06)

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Chavis, Shaeem (2019-02-06)" (2020). Parole Information Project  
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/412>

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***

**DIN:** 95-A-3982

**Document:** Appellate Unit - Appellant - Appellant's Counsel - Inst. Parole File - Central File  
**File #:** \_\_\_\_\_

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Chavis, Shaeem

**DIN:** 95-A-3982

**Facility:** Woodbourne CF

**AC No.:** 08-145-18 B

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

---

Appellant was sentenced to Murder in the second degree, Attempted Robbery in the first degree, CPW in the second degree and CPW in the third degree. Appellant challenges the July 2018 determination of the Board denying release and imposing a 18-month hold. Among other things, he argues the Board relied on erroneous information concerning the COMPAS instrument and the decision fails to provide adequate details.

A review of the record confirms the Board relied on erroneous information insofar as the decision states the COMPAS instrument's score for history of violence is high when in fact it is medium. In addition, the decision fails to provide adequate details to explain the reasons for the denial. As such, a *de novo* interview is appropriate.

**Recommendation:** Vacate and remand for de novo interview.