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 - Linares, Jorge L (2020-04-14)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Linares, Jorge L (2020-04-14)" (2021). Parole Information Project https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/588

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:	Linares, Joi	ge	Facility:	Otisville CF		
	NYSID:			Appeal Control No.:	12-021-19 B		
	DIN:	96-A-3483					
	Appearances: Decision appealed: Board Member(s) who participated: Papers considered:		Jorge Linares 96A3483 Otisville Correctional Facility P.O. Box 8 Otisville, New York 10963				
			November 2019 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 24 months.				
			Lee, Agostini, Samuels				
			Appellant's Letter-brief received December 19, 2019				
Appeals Unit Review: Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings and Re					ings and Recommendation		
	Records r	relied upon:			arole Board Report, Interview Transcript, Parole n 9026), COMPAS instrument, Offender Case		
	Figal Det	ermination:	The und vrsigned	determine that the de	ecision appealed is hereby:		
(J.J.	\square	Affirmed	Vacated, remanded fo	or de novo interview Modified to		
	/ the	missioner	Affirmed	Vacated, remanded fo	or de novo interview Modified to		
(liner		Affirmed	Vacated, remanded fo	or de novo interview Modified to		
	Com	missioner		energy and a second statement of the second			

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 $\frac{4/14/2020}{UR}$.

Distribution: Appeals Unit – Appellant - Appellant's Counsel - Inst. Parole File - Central File P-2002(B) (11/2018)

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name:	Linares, Jorge	DIN:	96-A-3483
Facility:	Otisville CF	AC No.:	12-021-19 B

<u>Findings</u>: (Page 1 of 1)

Appellant challenges the November 2019 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 24-month hold. Appellant is incarcerated for repeatedly raping and sexually abusing several of his minor children, and threatening them if they told what happened. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the decision is arbitrary and capricious in that the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the required statutory factors. 2) no aggravating factors exist. 3) the decision lacks substantial evidence. 4) the Board failed to list an facts in support of the statutory standard cited. 5) the decision lacks future guidance. 6) the decision illegally resentenced him. 7) the decision lacks detail. 8) the Board violated his rights under the due process clause of the constitution. 9) the decision violated his constitutional right to counsel. 10) the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law, and the 2017 regulations, in that the COMPAS was ignored, the attempted departure was illegally done, and statistically he is not a risk to re-offend. Also, the 2017 regulation creates a constitutional liberty interest in early release.

All of appellant's COMPAS scores are in the low or unlikely category. The Board decision says it is departing from the COMPAS due to his conviction after a jury trial. That is not a proper reason for a departure. As such, a de novo is warranted.

<u>Recommendation</u>: Vacate and remand for de novo interview.