

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Information Project – CURRENT

May 2022

Administrative Appeal Decision - Hargroves, Stephen (2021-11-19)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Hargroves, Stephen (2021-11-19)" (2022). Parole Information Project <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/864>

This Parole Document is brought to you for free and open access by the Parole Information Project – CURRENT 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: Hargroves, Stephen

DIN: 02-A-3428

Facility: Greene CF

AC No.: 05-074-21 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 2)

Appellant challenges the May 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 9-month hold. Appellant's instant offense is for entering a store, pointing a gun at the cashier and demanding money while threatening to kill her, then stealing money and merchandise from the store. Appellant raises two issues: 1) the District Attorney who was in office when he was convicted was later convicted for obstruction of justice charges. 2) appellant's mother is sick and elderly and needs appellant home to help.

Appellant doesn't claim the District Attorney who was in charge of the office at the time of his conviction was convicted of any misconduct concerning his individual case. Once an individual has been convicted of a crime, it is generally not the Board's role to reevaluate a claim of innocence. Matter of Silmon v Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704, 708 (2000); Copeland v New York State Board of Parole, 154 A.D.3d 1157, 63 N.Y.S.3d 548 (3d Dept. 2017). Alleged improprieties in a criminal trial are irrelevant if convicted. Grune v Board of Parole, 41 A.D.3d 1014, 838 N.Y.S.2d 694 (3d Dept. 2007). The Sentence and Order of Commitment establishes a valid judgment of conviction was entered. Piazza v Cunningham, 75 A.D.3d 1021, 904 N.Y.S.2d 679 (3d Dept. 2010) lv.app.den. 15 N.Y.3d 712, 912 N.Y.S.2d 577. Neither the Division of Parole nor DOCS can change a sentence imposed by the Court. Hill v Commissioner of Correctional Services, 71 A.D.3d 1210, 894 N.Y.S.2d 922 (3d Dept. 2010).

The Board may emphasize the nature of the instant offense. 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).

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Hargroves, Stephen

DIN: 02-A-3428

Facility: Greene CF

AC No.: 05-074-21 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 2)

The Board may consider inadequate release plans in denying parole. See, e.g., Matter of Delrosario v. Stanford, 140 A.D.3d 1515, 34 N.Y.S.3d 696 (3d Dept. 2016) (concern about reentry plans in case immigration does not deport incarcerated individual); Matter of Murphy v. State of New York Exec. Dep't Div. of Parole Appeals Unit, 2010 N.Y. Slip Op 32825(U), 2010 N.Y. Misc. Lexis 4926 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co. Sept. 30, 2010) (Ceresia S.C.J.) (denial based in part on absence of legitimate release plan).

The Board can give greater weight to statements made in the sentencing minutes. Williams v New York State Division of Parole, 114 A.D.3d 992, 979 N.Y.S.2d 868 (3d Dept. 2014). The Board is entitled to rely on the sentencing minutes. Platten v New York State Board of Parole, 153 A.D.3d 1509, 59 N.Y.S.3d 921 (3d Dept. 2017).

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).

Recommendation: Affirm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Hargroves, Stephen Facility: Greene CF
NYSID: [REDACTED] Appeal Control No.: 05-074-21 B
DIN: 02-A-3428

Appearances: Stephen Hargroves 02A3428
Greene Correctional Facility
P.O. Box 975
Coxsackie, New York 12051

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


Board Member(s) who participated: Alexander, Samuels

Papers considered: Appellant’s Letter-brief received September 20, 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.