

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 - Nichols, Lorenzo (2021-12-03)

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Nichols, Lorenzo (2021-12-03)" (2022). Parole Information Project  
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/824>

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Nichols, Lorenzo

**DIN:** 88-A-1701

**Facility:** Clinton CF

**AC No.:** 03-142-21 SC

**Findings:** (Page 1 of 5)

---

Appellant challenges the March 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 20-month hold. Appellant's instant offense is for having in his possession three firearms, two and one-fourth ounces plus nine grams of cocaine, and lots of heroin and marijuana. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the decision is arbitrary and capricious, and irrational bordering on impropriety, because according to appellant's counsel Board interviews show "...the level of incompetence is obvious, knowingly, and purposeful." 2) the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the statutory factors. 3) the decision violated the due process clause of the constitution. 4) the Board erroneously failed to consider if appellant could be re-sentenced due to the changes in the Rockefeller drug laws. 5) the Board didn't have all the records of his concurrent convictions from Florida and the federal government. 6) the Board failed to consider his youth and its attendant circumstances. 7) the DA letter and the community opposition letter included crimes he was not convicted of, and not all of the community opposition letters were turned over to counsel. 8) one of the Commissioners was a former parole officer, and as such is biased and should have recused herself. 9) the decision is based upon personal opinion and penal philosophy. 10) the decision lacks details. 11) the Board failed to comprehend that if granted parole, appellant will be sent to another prison. 12) the decision illegally resentenced him. 13) one commissioner read through a transcript of an interview that was vacated for a de novo. 14) the decision was predetermined. 15) the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law and the 2017 regulations in that the mostly positive evidence-based COMPAS was ignored, and the deviation was not properly done.

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

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Nichols, Lorenzo

**DIN:** 88-A-1701

**Facility:** Clinton CF

**AC No.:** 03-142-21 SC

**Findings:** (Page 2 of 5)

---

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 incarcerated individual committed the instant offense while on community supervision is a proper basis for denying parole release. *See, e.g., Matter of Byas v. Fischer*, 120 A.D.3d 1586-87, 1586, 992 N.Y.S.2d 813, 814 (4th Dept. 2014); Matter of Thompson v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 120 A.D.3d 1518, 1518-19, 992 N.Y.S.2d 464, 465 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Guzman v. Dennison, 32 A.D.3d 798, 799, 821 N.Y.S.2d 208, 208 (1st Dept. 2006).

The Board may place particular emphasis on the inmate's troubling course of conduct both during and after the commission of the instant offenses. Jones v New York State Board of Parole, 175 A.D.3d 1652, 108 N.Y.S.3d 505 (3d Dept. 2019).

The Board may conclude that high level drug trafficking leads to violence, as long as there is some support in the record, even if the conviction is for drugs only. Comfort v New York State Division of Parole, 68 A.D.3d 1295, 890 N.Y.S.2d 700 (3d Dept. 2009). The risk in the crime of hurting innocent bystanders may also be considered. Saunders v Travis, 238 A.D.2d 688, 656 N.Y.S.2d 404, 405 (3d Dept 1997), leave to appeal denied 90 N.Y.2d 805, 661 N.Y.S.2d 831 (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).

After considering the relevant factors, the Board was allowed to place greater emphasis on the incarcerated individual's criminal record including prior failures while under community supervision. *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. Herbert v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 97 A.D.2d 128, 468 N.Y.S.2d 881, 884 (1st Dept. 1983).

"[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).

Both during the interview and in the decision, the Board acknowledges what appellant's drug sentence would be if he was re-sentenced.

An incarcerated individual has no Constitutional right to be conditionally released on parole before expiration of a valid sentence. Greenholtz v. Inmates of Nebraska Penal & Correctional Complex, 442 U.S. 1, 99 S. Ct. 2100, 2104 (1979); Matter of Russo v. Bd. of Parole, 50 N.Y.2d

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Nichols, Lorenzo

**DIN:** 88-A-1701

**Facility:** Clinton CF

**AC No.:** 03-142-21 SC

**Findings:** (Page 3 of 5)

---

69, 427 N.Y.S.2d 982 (1980); Matter of Vineski v. Travis, 244 A.D.2d 737, 664 N.Y.S.2d 391 (3d Dept. 1997). The New York State parole scheme “holds out no more than a possibility of parole” and thus does not create a protected liberty interest implicating the due process clause. Matter of Russo, 50 N.Y.2d at 75-76, 427 N.Y.S.2d at 985; see also Barna v. Travis, 239 F.3d 169, 171 (2d Cir. 2001); Matter of Freeman v. New York State Div. of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1174, 800 N.Y.S.2d 797 (3d Dept. 2005).

Appellant’s assertion that the denial of parole release amounted to an improper resentencing is without merit inasmuch as the Board fulfilled its obligation to determine the propriety of release per Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A) and after considering the factors set forth therein. Executive Law § 259 et seq.; Penal Law § 70.40; Matter of Murray v. Evans, 83 A.D.3d 1320, 920 N.Y.S.2d 745 (3d Dept. 2011); Matter of Crews v. New York State Exec. Dept. Bd. of Parole Appeals Unit, 281 A.D.2d 672, 720 N.Y.S.2d 855 (3d Dept. 2001). The Board was vested with discretion to determine whether release was appropriate notwithstanding the minimum period of incarceration set by the Court. Matter of Burress v. Dennison, 37 A.D.3d 930, 829 N.Y.S.2d 283 (3d Dept. 2007); Matter of Cody v. Dennison, 33 A.D.3d 1141, 1142, 822 N.Y.S.2d 677 (3d Dept. 2006), *lv. denied*, 8 N.Y.3d 802, 830 N.Y.S.2d 698 (2007). The appellant has not in any manner been resentenced. Matter of Mullins v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 136 A.D.3d 1141, 1142, 25 N.Y.S.3d 698 (3d Dept. 2016).

The Board’s decision satisfied the criteria set out in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a), as it was sufficiently detailed to inform the incarcerated individual of the reasons for the denial of parole. 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 Kozlowski v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 108 A.D.3d 435, 968 N.Y.S.2d 87 (1st Dept. 2013); Matter of Little v. Travis, 15 A.D.3d 698, 788 N.Y.S.2d 628 (3d Dept. 2005); Matter of Davis v. Travis, 292 A.D.2d 742, 739 N.Y.S.2d 300 (3d Dept. 2002); 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).

There is no evidence the Board’s decision was predetermined based upon the instant offense. Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Hakim-Zaki v. New York State Div. of Parole, 29 A.D.3d 1190, 814 N.Y.S.2d 414 (3d Dept. 2006); Matter of Guerin v. New York State Div. of Parole, 276 A.D.2d 899, 695 N.Y.S.2d 622 (3d Dept. 2000).

The fact that a grant of parole in New York would not lead to appellant’s release, but rather, the beginning a lengthy prison sentence in another State, does not mean a Board denial is irrational bordering on impropriety. Perez v Evans, 76 A.D.3d 1130, 907 N.Y.S.2d 701 (3d Dept. 2010).

The decision is not based upon personal opinion or penal philosophy.

There is no support for the claim that the Board was biased against the incarcerated individual by the mere presence of Board members with law enforcement backgrounds, nor was the presence of

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Nichols, Lorenzo

**DIN:** 88-A-1701

**Facility:** Clinton CF

**AC No.:** 03-142-21 SC

**Findings:** (Page 4 of 5)

---

such Board members improper. Executive Law § 259-b(2) explicitly permits Board members with law enforcement experience.

Minor offender consideration does not apply whereas here the incarcerated individual was an adult (18 or older) at the time of the instant offense. See 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.2(c); cf. Matter of Cobb v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1500, 59 N.Y.S.3d 915 (3d Dept. 2017) (finding Hawkins inapplicable to petitioner who was over 18 at time of offense giving rise to maximum life sentence). Nor was this a murder conviction.

The Board is not required to have all of the records for convictions in other jurisdictions outside of New York State.

There is nothing erroneous in reviewing prior transcripts that have not been expunged. A mere reversal or vacatur of a prior interview is not an expungement.

That DA letters or community opposition may have erroneous information is irrelevant. Erroneous information, if not used in the decision as a basis for parole denial, will not lead to a reversal. Matter of Khatib v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 118 A.D.3d 1207, 988 N.Y.S.2d 286 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Restivo v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 70 A.D.3d 1096, 895 N.Y.S.2d 555 (3d Dept. 2010) [status report]; Matter of Grune v. Bd. of Parole, 41 A.D.3d 1014, 838 N.Y.S.2d 694 (3d Dept. 2007)[status report]; see also Matter of Gordon v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1502, 50 N.Y.S.3d 627 (3d Dept. 2017) [misstatement by commissioner in interview that incarcerated individual did not correct]; Matter of Perea v. Stanford, 149 A.D.3d 1392, 53 N.Y.S.3d 231 (3d Dept. 2017) [erroneous information in PBR which incarcerated individual corrected during interview]. Such fact does not require the Parole Board to expressly disavow in its decision inappropriate matters interjected by victims or to somehow quantify the extent or degree to which it considered appropriate parts of victim’s statements while disregarding other parts in its overall analysis of the statutory factors. The Board’s decision will be upheld if there is nothing indicating it was influenced by, placed weigh upon, or relied upon any improper matter. Duffy v New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 132 A.D.3d 1207, 19 N.Y.S.3d 610 (3d Dept. 2015).

“Arbitrary action is without sound basis in reason and is generally taken without regard to the facts’; or, put differently, ‘[r]ationality is what is reviewed under . . . the arbitrary and capricious standard.’” Hamilton v. New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 1270 n.1, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714, 716 (3d Dept. 2014) (quoting Matter of Pell v. Board of Educ., 34 N.Y.2d 222, 231, 356 N.Y.S.2d 833, 839 (1974)).

The petitioner has failed to demonstrate the Board’s decision was not made in accordance with the pertinent statutory requirements or was irrational “bordering on impropriety.” Matter of Silmon v.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Nichols, Lorenzo

**DIN:** 88-A-1701

**Facility:** Clinton CF

**AC No.:** 03-142-21 SC

**Findings:** (Page 5 of 5)

---

Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 476, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704 (2000) (quoting Matter of Russo v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 50 N.Y.2d 69, 427 N.Y.S.2d 982 (1980)).

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.

Appellant's claim that the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law is rejected. Dolan v New York State Board of Parole, 122 A.D.3d 1058, 995 N.Y.S.2d 850 (3d Dept. 2014); Tran v Evans, 126 A.D.3d 1196, 3 N.Y.S.3d 633 (3d Dept. 2015); Boccadisi v Stanford, 133 A.D.3d 1169, 20 N.Y.S.3d 477 (3d Dept. 2015). Furthermore, the 2011 Executive Law amendments have been incorporated into the regulations adopted by the Board in 2017.

The 2011 amendments to the Executive Law, as well as the state regulations governing parole, do not create a legitimate expectancy of release that would give rise to a due process interest in parole. Fuller v Evans, 586 Fed. Appx. 825 (2d Cir. 2014) cert.den. 135 S.Ct. 2807, 192 L.Ed2d 851.

Claims that the Executive Law amendments create objective and evidence based procedures, which creates a liberty interest, are incorrect. Franza v Stanford, 2019 WL 452052 (S.D.N.Y. 2019).

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).

The decision is consistent with amended 9 NYCRR § 8002.2(a) as there is no departure to explain. That is, the Board's decision was not impacted by a departure from a scale within the assessment. Notice of Adoption, NY Reg, Sept. 27, 2017 at 2. In fact, the Board cited the COMPAS instrument in its denial.

**Recommendation:** Affirm.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Nichols, Lorenzo

Facility: Clinton CF

NYSID: [REDACTED]

Appeal Control No.: 03-142-21 SC

DIN: 88-A-1701

Appearances: Cheryl Kates Esq.  
P.O. Box 734  
Fairport, New York 14450

Decision appealed: March 2021 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 20 months.

Board Member(s) who participated: Berliner, Segarra

Papers considered: Appellant’s Letter-brief received August 23, 2021

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:

[Signature] Affirmed  Vacated, remanded for de novo interview  Modified to

Commissioner

[Signature] Affirmed  Vacated, remanded for de novo interview  Modified to

Commissioner

[Signature] Affirmed  Vacated, remanded for de novo interview  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 Appellant and the Appellant’s Counsel, if any, on

12/23/2021 66