

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Administrative Appeal Documents

May 2021

Administrative Appeal Decision - Haskins, Matthew J (2020-02-24)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Haskins, Matthew J (2020-02-24)" (2021). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/569>

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.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Haskins, Matthew

Facility: Fishkill CF

NYSID: [REDACTED]

Appeal Control No.: 06-047-19 B

DIN: 19-B-0334

Appearances: Matthew Haskins, 19-B-0334
Fishkill Correctional Facility
271 Matteawan Road
P.O. Box 1245
Beacon, NY 12508

Decision appealed: May 2019 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 11 months.




Board Member(s) who participated: **Alexander, Berliner, Demosthenes**

Papers considered: Appellant's Brief received October 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:

	<input type="checkbox"/> Affirmed	<input type="checkbox"/> Vacated, remanded for de novo interview	<input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
Commissioner			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed	<input type="checkbox"/> Vacated, remanded for de novo interview	<input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
Commissioner			
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed	<input type="checkbox"/> Vacated, remanded for de novo interview	<input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
Commissioner			

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 2/24/2020 (AH).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Haskins, Matthew

DIN: 19-B-0334

Facility: Fishkill CF

AC No.: 06-047-19 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 3)

Appellant challenges the May 2019 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 11-month hold. The instant offense involved Appellant driving while intoxicated. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the Board improperly considered his past criminal history; and 2) the decision was biased, harsh, and excessive. These arguments are without merit.

As an initial matter, 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). 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.

The record as a whole, including the interview transcript, reflects that the Board considered the appropriate factors, including: the instant offense of Driving While Intoxicated – Alcohol/Drugs, 2nd Offense; Appellant’s criminal history including previous drinking and driving and drug-related offenses; Appellant’s institutional efforts including clean disciplinary record and participation in [REDACTED] and education; and release plans to live with his mother, [REDACTED]

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**Name:** Haskins, Matthew**DIN:** 19-B-0334**Facility:** Fishkill CF**AC No.:** 06-047-19 B**Findings:** (Page 2 of 3)

██████████, and work as a mechanic/service manager. The Board also had before it and considered, among other things, the case plan, the COMPAS instrument, the sentencing minutes, and multiple letters of support.

After considering all required factors, the Board acted within its discretion in determining release would not satisfy the standards provided for by Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A). In reaching its conclusion, the Board permissibly relied on the instant offense representing a continuation of Appellant's criminal history of drinking and driving and drug-related offenses, Appellant's statements during the interview that were not consistent with his criminal record, and Appellant's lack of insight into all forms of substance abuse being a concern. See Matter of Maricevic v. Evans, 86 A.D.3d 879, 927 N.Y.S.2d 471 (3d Dept. 2011); 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 Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 478, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704 (2000); 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 Beodeker v. Stanford, 164 A.D.3d 1555, 82 N.Y.S.3d 669 (3d Dept. 2018); Matter of Crawford v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 144 A.D.3d 1308, 46 N.Y.S.3d 228 (3d Dept. 2016), lv. denied, 29 N.Y.3d 901 (2017). The Board also cited the COMPAS instrument's elevated score for re-entry substance abuse and urged Appellant to complete required programming and develop a strong relapse prevention plan. See Matter of Espinal v. N.Y. State Bd. Of Parole, 172 A.D.3d 1816, 100 N.Y.S.3d 777 (3d Dept. 2019); Matter of Bush v. Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Allen v. Stanford, 161 A.D.3d 1503, 1506, 78 N.Y.S.3d 445 (3d Dept.), lv. denied, 32 N.Y.3d 903 (2018); Matter of Barrett v. New York State Div. of Parole, 242 A.D.2d 763, 661 N.Y.S.2d 857 (3d Dept. 1997); Matter of Delrosario v. Stanford, 140 A.D.3d 1515, 34 N.Y.S.3d 696 (3d Dept. 2016).

Appellant's contention that the Board improperly considered his past criminal history is without merit. After considering the relevant factors, the Board was allowed to place greater emphasis on Appellant's criminal record. See, e.g., Matter of Bello v. Bd. of Parole, 149 A.D.3d 1458, 53 N.Y.S.3d 715 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Davis v. Evans, 105 A.D.3d 1305, 963 N.Y.S.2d 485 (3d Dept. 2013); People ex rel. Yates v. Walters, 111 A.D.2d 839, 839, 490 N.Y.S.2d 573, 575 (2d Dept. 1985); People ex rel. Herbert v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881, 884 (1st Dept. 1983).

Appellant's argument that the decision was biased is also without merit. There must be support in the record to prove an alleged bias and proof that the decision flowed from such bias. Matter of Hernandez v. McSherry, 271 A.D.2d 777, 706 N.Y.S.2d 647 (3d Dept. 2000), lv. denied, 95 N.Y.2d 769, 722 N.Y.S.2d 472 (2000); see also Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Grune v. Board of Parole, 41 A.D.3d 1014, 838 N.Y.S.2d

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Haskins, Matthew

DIN: 19-B-0334

Facility: Fishkill CF

AC No.: 06-047-19 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 3)

694 (3d Dept. 2007). The transcript as a whole does not support Appellant's contention that the parole interview was conducted improperly or that he was denied a fair interview. Matter of Rivers v. Evans, 119 A.D.3d 1188, 989 N.Y.S.2d 400 (3d Dept. 2014); see also Matter of Mays v. Stanford, 55 N.Y.S.3d 502, 150 A.D.3d 1521 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Bonilla v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 32 A.D.3d 1070, 1071, 820 N.Y.S.2d 661, 662 (3d Dept. 2006). While Appellant attempts to characterize the interview as harsh, a review of the transcript reflects the Board properly carried out its obligation to evaluate Appellant's rehabilitative progress and fitness for parole release.

Finally, Appellant has failed to demonstrate that a hold of 11 months for discretionary release was excessive or improper. It is within the Board's discretion and authority to hold an inmate for up to 24 months, pursuant to Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a) and 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.3(b). Matter of Tatta v. State of N.Y., Div. of Parole, 290 A.D.2d 907, 737 N.Y.S.2d 163 (3d Dept. 2002), lv. denied, 98 N.Y.2d 604, 746 N.Y.S.2d 278 (2002); see also Matter of Campbell v. Evans, 106 A.D.3d 1363, 965 N.Y.S.2d 672 (3d Dept. 2013).

Recommendation: Affirm.