### Fordham Law School

## FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Administrative Appeal Documents

March 2022

Administrative Appeal Decision - Burr, David (2017-10-26)

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

### **Recommended Citation**

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Burr, David (2017-10-26)" (2022). Parole Information Project https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/723

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.

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 10

STATE OF NEW YORK-BOARD OF PAROLE RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/02/2019

# Administrative Appeal Decision Notice

inmate Name: Duri, David	racinty: Adount Confectional ra	Circy
NYSID No.:	Appeal Control #: 05-252-17-B	9
Dept. DIN#: 84B0365	a de	803
Appearances:	- 1000 pc - 1000	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
For the Board, the Appeals Unit	3.3	9 H 4
For Appellant:	David Burr 84B0365	
# <b>**</b> 11 - 8	Auburn Correctional Facility	
10 ~	P.O. Box 618	2
e ee e	135 State Street	
ell ligg 💉	Auburn, New York 13021	¥ <u>9</u>
	was o're o're word	202 A
Board Member(s) who participate	ed in appealed from decision: Ludlow, W. Si	nith
D.:::	75 11 62 11 11 11	
Decision appealed from: 5/201	7-Denial of discretionary release, with imposi	tion of 18 month hold.
Dlandings considered: Uandwritt	en letter on behalf of the pro se appellant rece	brad on Contombon 10 2017
	of the Appeals Unit's Findings and Recomme	
Statement	of the Appeals Out a Findings and Accomme	nation
Documents relied upon: Presente	nce Investigation Report, Parole Board Repo	rt Interview Transcript
	oard Release Decision (Form 9026), COMPA	
1		o, 1111 ouse I tuin.
Final Determination: The under	rsigned have determined that the decision from	n which this appeal was taken
be and the	same is hereby	
( 1 (N c).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	€
	rmed Reversed for De Novo Interview	Modified to
Commissioner		¥
	and the second s	
Affi	rmed Reversed for De Novo Interview	Modified to
Commissionel		€)
line Man	med Reversed for De Novo Interview	Modified to
Commissioner	med Reversed for De 14040 Interview	
Commissioner		* .
If the Final Determination is at vo	riance with Findings and Recommendation	of Anneals Unit, written
	termination must be annexed hereto.	ey represent cours, in order
A SM A TO THE STATE OF THE STAT		
	ed Statement of the Appeals Unit's Findings a	
the Parole Board, if any, were mail	led to the Inmate and the Inmate's Counsel, if	any, on 10/0(0)17 Pf.
7 2		a Contraction
	e - Inmate's Counsel - Inst. Parole File - Cent	ral File
P-2002(B) (5/2011)	e e	* 12
	s	R

FILED: ALBANY COUNTY CLERK 11/02/2019 05:08 PM

NYSCEF DOC. NO. 10

INDEX NO.

RECEIVED NYSCEF: 11/02/2019

### STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

### STATEMENT OF APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Inmate Name: Burr, David Facility: Auburn Correctional Facility

NYSID No.: Appeal Control #: 05-252-17-B

Dept. DIN# 84B0365

### Findings:

The pro se appellant has submitted a handwritten letter to serve as the perfected appeal. For the reason explained below, only one issue raised will be addressed.

One of appellant's claims is the Board violated his rights under the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment to the constitution in that he was only 17 years old when he committed the instant offense. Appellant asserts numerous different reasons as to how the 8<sup>th</sup> amendment was violated.

In response, appellant is correct he was only 17 years old when he committed the instant offense. And the Board decision doesn't mention any 8<sup>th</sup> amendment factors concerning his youth and its attendant circumstances involving the instant offense. This fact alone requires a de novo interview be held.

### Recommendation:

Accordingly, it is recommended the decision of the Board be vacated, and that a de novo interview in front of a different panel of Commissioners be held forthwith.