

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Administrative Appeal Documents

May 2022

Administrative Appeal Decision - Doleyres, Harvey (2022-01-25)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Doleyres, Harvey (2022-01-25)" (2022). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/817>

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

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Doleyres, Harvey

DIN: 20-R-0419

Facility: Mid-State CF

AC No.: 03-084-21 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 3)

Appellant challenges the February 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 24-month hold. Appellant's instant offense was working as a pimp by employing a woman to engage in sexual relations with men for money. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) his concurrent sentence in New Jersey has also been served. 2) he was unable to complete programming due to covid program suspensions, and the prison he was in didn't have sex offender programming. 3) he will no longer have the anger issues as he since taken appropriate therapeutic programming to cover this problem. 4) he was very nervous at the interview, which is why he was unable to adequately express his remorse. 5) the COMPAS bar in dispute is in error, as he is not a violent person.

Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A) requires the Board to consider factors relevant to the specific incarcerated individual, including, but not limited to, the individual'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 Schendel v. Stanford, 185 A.D.3d 1365, 1366, 126 N.Y.S.3d 428, 429 (3rd Dept. 2020); Matter of Campbell v. Stanford, 173 A.D.3d 1012, 1015, 105 N.Y.S.3d 461 (2d Dept. 2019); Matter of Phillips v. Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 21, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121, 124 (1st Dept. 2007).

The Board may emphasize the nature of the instant offense and that it was an escalation in illegal behavior. See Matter of Stanley v. New York State Div. of Parole, 92 A.D.3d 948, 948-49, 939 N.Y.S.2d 132, 134 (2d Dept.), lv. denied, 19 N.Y.3d 806, 949 N.Y.S.2d 343 (2012); Matter of Symmonds v. Dennison, 21 A.D.3d 1171, 1172, 801 N.Y.S.2d 90, 90 (3d Dept.), lv. denied, 6 N.Y.3d 701, 810 N.Y.S.2d 415 (2005); Matter of Warren v. New York State Div. of Parole, 307 A.D.2d 493, 493, 761 N.Y.S.2d 883 (3d Dept. 2003); Matter of Garcia v. New York State Div. of Parole, 239 A.D.2d 235, 239-40, 657 N.Y.S.2d 415, 418 (1st Dept. 1997).

The fact that the Board afforded greater weight to the incarcerated individual's criminal history, as opposed to other positive factors, does not render the denial of parole for that reason irrational or improper. 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 McKee v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 157 A.D.2d 944, 550 N.Y.S.2d 204 (3d Dept. 1990).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Doleyres, Harvey

DIN: 20-R-0419

Facility: Mid-State CF

AC No.: 03-084-21 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 3)

The Board may consider an incarcerated individual's failure to comply with DOCCS rules in denying parole. See Matter of Almonte v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 145 A.D.3d 1307, 42 N.Y.S.3d 691 (3d Dept. 2016), lv. denied, 29 N.Y.3d 905 (2017); Matter of Karlin v. Cully, 104 A.D.3d 1285, 1286, 960 N.Y.S.2d 827, 828 (4th Dept. 2013); Matter of Stanley v. New York State Div. of Parole, 92 A.D.3d 948, 948-49, 939 N.Y.S.2d 132, 134 (2d Dept.), lv. denied, 19 N.Y.3d 806, 949 N.Y.S.2d 343 (2012). Appellant states that subsequent to the interview, he remedied this problem. However, appellate review is limited to the record made at nisi prius, meaning new facts may not be injected into the record, absent matters which may be judicially noticed. Muntaqim v Keyser, 184 A.D.3d 189, 125 N.Y.S.3d 484 (3d Dept. 2020); Broida v Bancroft, 103 A.D.2d 88, 93 (1984); Paoletti v Karian, 266 A.D.2d 691 (1999); Jackson v Dow Chemical Co., 295 A.D.2d 855, 857 (2002).

The Board stressing the nature of the underlying offense, troubling criminal history and prison disciplinary record, does not constitute irrationality bordering on impropriety. Perez v Evans, 76 A.D.3d 1130, 907 N.Y.S.2d 701 (3d Dept. 2010); Mentor v New York State Division of Parole, 87 A.D.3d 1245, 930 N.Y.S.2d 302 (3d Dept. 2011) lv.app.den. 18 N.Y.3d 803, 938 N.Y.S.2d 860 (2012); Stanley v New York State Division of Parole, 92 A.D.3d 948, 939 N.Y.S.2d 132 (2d Dept. 2012); Moore v New York State Board of Parole, 137 A.D.3d 1375, 26 N.Y.S.3d 412 (3d Dept. 2016).

The Board may consider an incarcerated individual's need to complete rehabilitative programming in denying parole. See Matter of Jones v. N.Y. State Bd. of Parole, 175 A.D.3d 1652, 1652, 108 N.Y.S.3d 505, 506 (3rd Dept. 2019); 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); see also Matter of Connelly v. New York State Div. of Parole, 286 A.D.2d 792, 729 N.Y.S.2d 808, 809 (3d Dept.), appeal dismissed 97 N.Y.2d 677, 738 N.Y.S.2d 291 (2001). The Board may consider an incarcerated individual's need to complete rehabilitative programming even where a delay in commencement is through no fault of the individual. See Matter of Barrett v. New York State Div. of Parole, 242 A.D.2d 763, 661 N.Y.S.2d 857 (3d Dept. 1997).

The Board may cite the failure of the inmate to acknowledge the impact of the criminal conduct on the victim. Gaito v New York State Board of Parole, 238 A.D.2d 634, 655 N.Y.S.2d 692 (3d Dept 1997); Romer v Dennison, 24 A.D.3d 866, 804 N.Y.S.2d 872 (3d Dept. 2005).

The Board may consider denial of an EEC. Matter of Grigger v. Goord, 41 A.D.3d 1128, 840 N.Y.S.2d 174 (3d Dept. 2007); see also Matter of Frett v. Coughlin, 156 A.D.2d 779, 550 N.Y.S.2d 61 (3d Dept. 1989) (issuance of EEC is purely discretionary and denial of same amounts to no more than an interlocutory determination which may be considered by the Parole Board).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Doleyses, Harvey

DIN: 20-R-0419

Facility: Mid-State CF

AC No.: 03-084-21 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 3)

“[T]here is a strong rehabilitative component in the statute that may be given effect by considering remorse.” Matter of Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 478, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704 (2000). The Board may consider the inmate’s limited expression of remorse. Beodeker v Stanford, 164 A.D.3d 1555, 82 N.Y.S.3d 669 (3d Dept. 2018); Pulliam v Board of Parole, 197 A.D.3d 1495, 153 N.Y.S.3d 704 (3d Dept. 2021). And that his remorse was shallow. Campbell v Stanford, 173 A.D.3d 1012, 105 N.Y.S.3d 461 (2nd Dept. 2019). Once again, appellant is attempting to introduce new facts into the record, which as was cited above, is not permitted on appeal.

The Board may consider negative aspects of the COMPAS instrument. Matter of Espinal v. New York Bd. of Parole, 172 A.D.3d 1816, 100 N.Y.S.3d 777 (3d Dept. 2019) (COMPAS instrument yielded mixed results); Matter of Bush v. Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017) (COMPAS instrument with mixed results including substance abuse relevant given use before crime); Matter of Wade v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017) (low risk felony violence but probable risk for substance abuse alcohol related crimes); Matter of Crawford v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 144 A.D.3d 1308, 46 N.Y.S.3d 228 (3d Dept. 2016) (scores not uniformly low including family support), lv. denied, 29 N.Y.3d 901, 57 N.Y.S.3d 704 (2017). Nor did appellant make any effort before the interview to go through the proper procedures to protest what he considered to be an incorrect COMPAS score.

The Board decision doesn’t misstate the sentence from the New Jersey. There is no support in the record that the Board relied upon incorrect or erroneous information. Shark v New York State Division of Parole Chair, 110 A.D.3d 1134, 972 N.Y.S.2d 741 (3d Dept. 2013); Khatib v New York State Board of Parole, 118 A.D.3d 1207, 988 N.Y.S.2d 286 (3d Dept. 2014); Boccadisi v Stanford, 133 A.D.3d 1169, 20 N.Y.S.3d 477 (3d Dept. 2015); Peterson v Stanford, 151 A.D.3d 1960, 59 N.Y.S.3d 219 (4th Dept. 2017).

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.

Recommendation: Affirm.

