

Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Administrative Appeal Documents

June 2023

Administrative Appeal Decision - Brosseau, Eugene M (2019-08-23)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Brosseau, Eugene M (2019-08-23)" (2023). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/1371>

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

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Brosseau, Eugene Facility: Groveland CF

NYSID: [REDACTED] Appeal Control No.: 03-083-19 B

DIN: 84-C-1133

Appearances: Eugene Brosseau 84C1133
Groveland Correctional Facility
P.O. Box 50
Sonyea, New York 14556

Decision appealed: February 2019 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 24 months.

Board Member(s) who participated: Coppola, Crangle

Papers considered: Appellant's Brief received May 23, 2019

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 Inmate and the Inmate's Counsel, if any, on 8/23/19.

Distribution: Appeals Unit – Appellant - Appellant's Counsel - Inst. Parole File - Central File
P-2002(B) (11/2018)

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Brosseau, Eugene

DIN: 84-C-1133

Facility: Groveland CF

AC No.: 03-083-19 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 4)

Appellant challenges the February 2019 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 24-month hold. Appellant is incarcerated for two different crimes. In the first, he kidnapped a woman by threatening her with a razor blade box cutter, threw her into the trunk of his car, and drove to another location and then raped her. After the rape, he threw the woman back into the trunk of the car, poured gas on the car and lit it on fire to try to kill her. In the second, he entered a store and grabbed the clerk and threw her to the ground and repeatedly choked and banged her head on the ground, and then raped her and took money from the store cash register. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the decision is arbitrary and capricious in that all the Board did was as in prior interviews to look at old outdated comments from before he started his prison rehabilitation. 2) the Board has resentenced him to life without parole. 3) his criminal sentence is illegal and he is past the maximum. 4) the Board was biased. 5) statistically he is unlikely to reoffend. 6) there should be three Commissioners.

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 inmate 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 inmate, including, but not limited to, the inmate’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).

Although the Board placed great emphasis on the violent nature of the crimes and petitioner’s criminal history, it was not required to discuss or give equal weight to each statutory factor. Matter of Wise v. State Div. of Parole, 54 A.D.3d 463, 464, 862 N.Y.S.2d 644, 645 (3d Dept. 2008). The fact that the Board afforded greater weight to the inmate’s criminal history, as opposed to other

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Brosseau, Eugene

DIN: 84-C-1133

Facility: Groveland CF

AC No.: 03-083-19 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 4)

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).

Although the Board placed particular emphasis on the nature of the crimes, the Board considered other factors and was not required to give equal weight to or discuss each factor considered. Matter of Gordon v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1502, 50 N.Y.S.3d 627 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Arena v. New York State Dep't of Corr. & Cmty. Supervision, 156 A.D.3d 1101, 65 N.Y.S.3d 471 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Peralta v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 157 A.D.3d 1151, 69 N.Y.S.3d 885 (3d Dept. 2018).

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 Board may cite the fact that appellant was on parole when he committed the crime.” Matter of Guzman v. Dennison, 32 A.D.3d 798, 799, 821 N.Y.S.2d 208, 208 (1st Dept. 2006); Byas v. Fischer, 120 A.D.3d 1586-87, 1586, 992 N.Y.S.2d 813, 814 (4th Dept. 2014).

The Board’s determination about the appellant’s serious and repetitive nature of his crimes was within its discretion and is not subject to judicial review.” Matter of Wright v. Travis, 284 A.D.2d 544, 727 N.Y.S.2d 630 (2d Dept. 2001); Webb v. Travis, 26 A.D.3d 614, 810 N.Y.S.2d 233 (3d Dept. 2006).

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).

As for an alleged similarity to prior Board decisions, since the Board is required to consider the same statutory factors each time an inmate appears before it, it follows that the same aspects of the individual’s record may again constitute the primary grounds for a denial of parole. Matter of Hakim v. Travis, 302 A.D.2d 821, 754 N.Y.S.2d 600 (3d Dept. 2003); Matter of Bridget v. Travis, 300 A.D.2d 776, 750 N.Y.S.2d 795 (3d Dept. 2002). The Board is required to consider the same factors each time he appears in front of them. Matter of Williams v. New York State Div. of Parole,

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Brosseau, Eugene

DIN: 84-C-1133

Facility: Groveland CF

AC No.: 03-083-19 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 4)

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). And the claim that the statements used may be from years ago, and would be different today, is pure total baseless speculation.

Petitioner attempts to reduce parole release decisions to a mathematical equation and elevate statistics to a statutory factor that the Board must consider and address in denial decisions. However, that is not the law and the cited statistics do not translate into a calculation of Petitioner's re-offense risk. Moreover, the Board does not hold evidentiary hearings but conducts interviews in furtherance of its discretionary decisions. Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A); Matter of Banks v. Stanford, 159 A.D.3d 134, 144, 71 N.Y.S.3d 515, 522 (2d Dept. 2018). Each case is unique and the Board is not bound by statistics. Cf. Matter of Phillips v. Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 22, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121, 124-25 (1st Dept. 2007) ("each case is sui generis, and the Board has full authority in each instance to give the various factors a unique weighted value"). Instead, there must be a showing of irrationality "bordering on impropriety" before judicial intervention is warranted. Matter of Banks, 159 A.D.3d at 142, 71 N.Y.S.3d 515, 521. Statistical probabilities alone do not generate constitutional protections. Connecticut Board of Pardons v Dumschat, 452 U.S. 458, 101 S.Ct. 2460, 2465, 69 L.Ed.2d 158 (1981). Neither the mere possibility of release, nor a statistical probability of release, gives rise to a legitimate expectancy of release on parole. Graziano v Pataki, 689 F.3d 110 (2nd Cir. 2012).

Per 9 N.Y.C.R.R. 8006.1 et. seq., the Appeals Unit has no subject matter jurisdiction over the legality of the underlying criminal sentence. 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 Board of Parole nor DOCCS 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). DOCS is conclusively bound the contents of commitment papers accompanying a prisoner. Murray v Goord, 1 N.Y.3d 29, 32 (2003).

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

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Brosseau, Eugene

DIN: 84-C-1133

Facility: Groveland CF

AC No.: 03-083-19 B

Findings: (Page 4 of 4)

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). Nothing in the Board’s decision indicates a permanent denial of parole consideration. Hodge v Griffin, 2014 WL 2453333 (SDNY 2014).

Denial of parole is neither arbitrary nor capricious when the Parole Board relied on the factors defined by the New York statute. Hodge v Griffin, 2014 WL 2453333(S.D.N.Y. 2014) citing Romer v Travis, 2003 WL 21744079. An arbitrary action is one without sound basis in reason and without regard to the facts. Rationality is what is reviewed under an arbitrary and capricious standard. Hamilton v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014). An action is arbitrary and capricious when it is taken without sound basis in reason or regard to the facts. Ward v City of Long Beach, 20 N.Y.3d 1042 (2013). Denial is neither arbitrary nor capricious when the Board relies on factors defined by New York statute. Siao-Paul v. Connolly, 564 F. Supp. 2d 232, 242 (S.D.N.Y. 2008); Hanna v New York State Board of Parole, 169 A.D.3d 503, 92 N.Y.S.3d 621 (1st Dept. 2019).

Per 9 N.Y.C.R.R. 8002.2(b), only two Commissioners are required to conduct a Parole Board Release Interview.

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.