

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 - Blanks, Anthony (2021-11-19)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Blanks, Anthony (2021-11-19)" (2022). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/854>

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: Blanks, Anthony

DIN: 78-A-0538

Facility: Sing Sing CF

AC No.: 05-023-21 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 4)

Appellant challenges the April 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 9-month hold. The instant offense involved Appellant causing the death of a police officer by shooting the officer with the officer's own gun after a struggle. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the decision was arbitrary and capricious because the Board relied solely on the seriousness of the offense; 2) the Board disingenuously relied on an outdated [REDACTED] report; 3) the Board completely disregarded the COMPAS instrument; 4) the decision was not made in accordance with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law requiring a future-focused risk assessment; 5) the Board failed to adequately consider all the required statutory factors; 6) the Board failed to consider Appellant's young age as a mitigating factor; 7) the denial amounted to an unauthorized resentencing; 8) the decision was conclusory and lacked detail; and 9) the denial was in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. 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 [incarcerated individual] 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 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 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).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Blanks, Anthony

DIN: 78-A-0538

Facility: Sing Sing CF

AC No.: 05-023-21 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 4)

The record as a whole, including the interview transcript, reflects that the Board considered the appropriate factors, including: the instant offense of Murder in the first degree and Criminal Possession of a Weapon in the second degree; Appellant's [REDACTED] history; Appellant's lack of a prior criminal record; Appellant's institutional efforts including completion of all required programs, work in [REDACTED] units, and no misbehavior reports since his last appearance; and release plans to seek housing from a reentry organization. The Board also had before it and considered, among other things, the case plan, the COMPAS instrument, the sentencing minutes, official and community opposition to Appellant's release, and Appellant's parole packet featuring letters of recommendation from four corrections officers, letters of reasonable assurance, and a personal statement written by Appellant.

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, concerns about Appellant's reentry plans including a general lack of a support system in the community, Appellant's [REDACTED] history including references to aggressive behavior after receiving a misbehavior report, and official and community opposition to Appellant's release. See, e.g., Matter of Olmosperez v. Evans, 114 A.D.3d 1077, 1078, 980 N.Y.S.2d 845, 846 (3d Dept. 2014), aff'd 26 N.Y.3d 1014, 21 N.Y.S.3d 686 (2015); Matter of Siao-Pao v. Dennison, 51 A.D.3d 105, 108, 854 N.Y.S.2d 348, 351 (1st Dept.), aff'd 11 N.Y.3d 777, 866 N.Y.S.2d 602 (2008); Matter of Cardenales v. Dennison, 37 A.D.3d 371, 371, 830 N.Y.S.2d 152, 153 (1st Dept. 2007); Matter of Delrosario v. Stanford, 140 A.D.3d 1515, 34 N.Y.S.3d 696 (3d Dept. 2016); Matter of Dudley v. Travis, 227 A.D.2d 863, 642 N.Y.S.2d 386 (3d Dept.), lv. denied, 88 N.Y.2d 812, 649 N.Y.S.2d 379 (1996); Matter of Walker v. Travis, 252 A.D.2d 360, 676 N.Y.S.2d 52 (1st Dept. 1998); Matter of Jones v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 175 A.D.3d 1652, 1652, 108 N.Y.S.3d 505, 506 (3d Dept. 2019). The Board also cited elevated COMPAS scores for reentry challenges. 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).

There is no merit to Appellant's claim that the Board disingenuously relied on an outdated [REDACTED] report. The Board may take into account an incarcerated individual's [REDACTED] when denying parole release. See Matter of Baker v. Russi, 188 A.D.2d 771, 591 N.Y.S.2d 540 (3d Dept. 1992); see also Pender v. Travis, 243 A.D.2d 889, 662 N.Y.S.2d 642 (3d Dept. 1997), lv. denied, 91 N.Y.2d 810, 670 N.Y.S.2d 404 (1998). During the interview, the Board acknowledged Appellant's improved disciplinary record and expressed optimism that Appellant had aged out of the aggressive behavior referenced in [REDACTED] reports. However, in making its final determination, the Board was entitled to remain concerned that the difficulty Appellant had with authority would reveal itself in the community again.

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Blanks, Anthony

DIN: 78-A-0538

Facility: Sing Sing CF

AC No.: 05-023-21 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 4)

Appellant’s argument that the Board disregarded the COMPAS and failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law is likewise without merit. The 2011 amendments require procedures incorporating risk and needs principles to “assist” the Board in making parole release decisions. Executive Law § 259–c(4). The Board satisfies this requirement in part by using the COMPAS instrument. Matter of Montane v. Evans, 116 A.D.3d 197, 202, 981 N.Y.S.2d 866, 870 (3d Dept. 2014); see also Matter of Hawthorne v. Stanford, 135 A.D.3d 1036, 1042, 22 N.Y.S.3d 640, 645 (3d Dept. 2016); 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 Robles v. Fischer, 117 A.D.3d 1558, 1559, 985 N.Y.S.2d 386, 387 (4th Dept. 2014). This is encompassed in the Board’s regulations. 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.2(a). However, the COMPAS is not predictive and was never intended to be the sole indicator of risk and needs as the Board gets risk and needs information from a variety of sources, including the statutory factors and the interview. Notably, the 2011 amendments did not eliminate the requirement that the Board conduct a case-by-case review of each incarcerated individual by considering the statutory factors including the instant offense. The amendments also did not change the three substantive standards that the Board is required to apply when deciding whether to grant parole. Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A). Thus, the COMPAS cannot mandate a particular result. Matter of King v. Stanford, 137 A.D.3d 1396, 26 N.Y.S.3d 815 (3d Dept. 2016). Rather, the COMPAS is an additional consideration that the Board must weigh along with the statutory factors for the purposes of deciding whether the three standards are satisfied. See Matter of Rivera v. N.Y. State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1107, 1108, 990 N.Y.S.2d 295 (3d Dept. 2014); accord Matter of Dawes v. Annucci, 122 A.D.3d 1059, 994 N.Y.S.2d 747 (3d Dept. 2014); see also Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017). That is exactly what occurred here.

Inasmuch as Appellant contends the Board failed to consider requisite factors, there is a presumption of honesty and integrity that attaches to Judges and administrative fact-finders. See People ex rel. Carlo v. Bednosky, 294 A.D.2d 382, 383, 741 N.Y.S.2d 703 (2d Dept. 2002); People ex. rel. Johnson v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 180 A.D.2d 914, 916, 580 N.Y.S.2d 957, 959 (3d Dept. 1992). The Board is presumed to follow its statutory commands and internal policies in fulfilling its obligations. See Garner v. Jones, 529 U.S. 244, 256, 120 S. Ct. 1362, 1371 (2000).

The presence of mitigating factors does not automatically entitle the incarcerated individual to release or preclude the Board from emphasizing the serious nature of her criminal behavior. See 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). Nonetheless, the record reflects that the Board considered Appellant’s age at the time of the instant offense. (Tr. at 10.)

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Blanks, Anthony

DIN: 78-A-0538

Facility: Sing Sing CF

AC No.: 05-023-21 B

Findings: (Page 4 of 4)

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) and 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.3(b), 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). The Board addressed many of the factors and principles considered in individualized terms and explained those that ultimately weighed most heavily in its deliberations.

Finally, inasmuch as Appellant argues he did not receive the same fair consideration as other similarly situated incarcerated individuals, the decision has a rational relationship to the objectives of community safety and respect for the law. Matter of Valderrama v. Travis, 19 A.D.3d 904, 905, 796 N.Y.S.2d 758 (3d Dept. 2005). There is no merit to his equal protection claim. Matter of Williams v. New York State Div. of Parole, 70 A.D.3d 1106, 894 N.Y.S.2d 224 (3d Dept.), *lv. denied*, 14 N.Y.3d 709, 901 N.Y.S.2d 143 (2010); Matter of Tatta v. Dennison, 26 A.D.3d 663, 809 N.Y.S.2d 296 (3d Dept.), *lv. denied*, 6 N.Y.3d 714, 816 N.Y.S.2d 750 (2006); Matter of DeFino v. Travis, 18 A.D.3d 1079, 795 N.Y.S.2d 477 (3d Dept. 2005).

Recommendation: Affirm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Blanks, Anthony

Facility: Sing Sing CF

NYSID: [REDACTED]

Appeal Control No.: 05-023-21 B

DIN: 78-A-0538

Appearances: George M. Groglio, Esq.
219 Westchester Avenue
Suite 300
Port Chester, NY 10573

Decision appealed: April 2021, decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 9 months.


Board Member(s) who participated: Agostini, Corley


Papers considered: Appellant's Brief received September 8, 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:

 Affirmed Vacated, remanded for de novo interview Modified to _____
Commissioner

 Affirmed Vacated, remanded for de novo interview Modified to _____
Commissioner

 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

11/19/2021 66.