

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 - Stuart, Kevin D (2021-10-15)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Stuart, Kevin D (2021-10-15)" (2023). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/1390>

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: Zgaljic, John Facility: Otisville CF
NYSID: [REDACTED] Appeal Control No.: 04-115-19 B
DIN: 88-A-3224

Appearances: John Zgaljic 88A
Otisville Correctional Facility
P.O. Box 8
Otisville, New York 10963

Decision appealed: March 2019 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 18 months.


Board Member(s) who participated: Cruse, Davis, Demosthenes

Papers considered: Appellant's Letter-brief received May 29, 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 9/30/19.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Zgaljic, John

DIN: 88-A-3224

Facility: Otisville CF

AC No.: 04-115-19 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 6)

Appellant challenges the March 2019 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing an 18-month hold. Appellant is incarcerated for two separate crimes. He was first convicted of Manslaughter 1st Degree. That crime consisted of the petitioner entering the victim's residence, placing a pillow over her face and putting his hands on her throat, and strangling/suffocating her to death. In the second crime he was convicted of Murder 2nd Degree. This crime consisted of the petitioner strangling another woman to death in her residence, and taking her TV, credit cards, jewelry, etc. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the decision is arbitrary and capricious in that the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the required statutory factors. 2) the decision lacks substantial evidence. 3) no aggravating factors exist. 4) the Board failed to cite any facts in support of the statutory standard referred to. 5) the Board failed to provide any future guidance. 6) the decision lacks details. 7) the Board ignored the minimum sentence set by the court and illegally resentenced him. 8) community opposition and penal philosophy are not allowed. 9) the appellant was not allowed to see all documents used by the Board. 10) appellant was denied his right to counsel. 11) the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law, and the 2017 regulations, in that the COMPAS was ignored, and the departure language was not complied with. This is in violation of the due process liberty interest created by these laws and regulations.

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).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Zgaljic, John

DIN: 88-A-3224

Facility: Otisville CF

AC No.: 04-115-19 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 6)

The Board “was not required to give each factor equal weight and could place greater emphasis on the gravity of petitioner’s crimes.” Matter of Moore v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 137 A.D.3d 1375, 26 N.Y.S.3d 412, 413 (3d Dept. 2016).

The seriousness of the offense alone has long been held to constitute a sufficient ground to deny parole release. Matter of Secilmic v Keane, 25 A.D.2d 628, 639 N.Y.S.2d 437 (2d Dept 1996); Howithi v Travis, 19 A.D.3rd 727, 796 N.Y.S.2d 195 (3d Dept. 2005); Matter of Dudley v Brown, 227 A.D.2d 863, 642 N.Y.S.2d 386 (3d Dept 1996), lv to app. den. 88 N.Y.2d 812; People ex rel Thomas v Superintendent Arthurkill Correctional Facility, 124 A.D.2d 848, 508 N.Y.S.2d 564 (2d Dept 1986) app. den. 69 N.Y.2d 611.

The Board was persuaded by the horrific nature of the crimes. Beodeker v Stanford, 164 A.D.3d 1555, 82 N.Y.S.3d 669 (3d Dept. 2018).

The Board’s emphasis on the violent nature of the crime does not establish irrationality bordering on impropriety. Pulliam v Dennison, 38 A.D.3d 963, 832 N.Y.S.2d 304 (3d Dept. 2007); Sterling v Dennison, 38 A.D.3d 1145, 833 N.Y.S.2d 684 (3d Dept. 2007); Marziale v Alexander, 62 A.D.3d 1227, 879 N.Y.S.2d 636 (3d Dept. 2009). The Board may conclude that the violent nature of the crime is an overriding consideration warranting the denial of parole release. Rodney v Dennison, 24 A.D.3d 1152, 805 N.Y.S.2d 743 (3d Dept. 2005). The Board may emphasize the violent nature of the instant offense. Marnell v Dennison, 35 A.D.3d 995, 824 N.Y.S.2d 812 (3d Dept. 2006), lv.den. 8 N.Y.3d 807, 833 N.Y.S.2d 426 (2007).

The Board may consider the brutality of the offense. Dudley v Travis, 227 A.D.2d 863, 642 N.Y.S.2d 386, 387 (3d Dept 1996), leave to appeal denied 88 N.Y.2d 812, 649 N.Y.S.2d 379; Borcsok v New York State Division of Parole, 34 A.D.3d 961, 823 N.Y.S.2d 310 lv. den. 8 N.Y.3d 803, 830 N.Y.S.2d 699 (3d Dept. 2006); Matter of Partee v Evans, 117 A.D.3d 1258, 984 N.Y.S.2d 894 (3d Dept. 2014); Bush v Annucci, 148 A.D.3d 1392, 50 N.Y.S.3d 180 (3d Dept. 2017). Per Executive Law 259-i(2)(c)(A), the Board may place greater weight on the violence and level of brutality of the crime, as opposed to an excellent institutional record and achievement. Garofolo v Dennison, 53 A.D.3d 734, 860 N.Y.S.2d 336 (3d Dept. 2008); Applegate v New York State Board of Parole, 164 A.D.3d 996, 82 N.Y.S.3d 240 (3d Dept. 2018).

The Board may consider an inmate’s history of drug and/or alcohol abuse. Matter of Espinal v. New York Bd. of Parole, 2019 NY Slip Op 04080, 2019 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 4057 (3d Dept. May 23, 2019) (substance abuse history); Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017) (substance abuse history and risk of future drug abuse); Matter of Dean v. New York State Div. of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1207, 1208, 801 N.Y.S.2d 92, 93 (3d Dept. 2005) (involvement with weapons and drugs), lv. denied, 6 N.Y.3d 705, 812 N.Y.S.2d 34 (2006); Matter of Sanchez v. Dennison, 21 A.D.3d 1249, 801 N.Y.S.2d 423 (3d Dept. 2005) (history of drug abuse); Matter of Llull v. Travis, 287 A.D.2d 845, 846, 731 N.Y.S.2d 405, 406 (3d Dept. 2001)

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Zgaljic, John

DIN: 88-A-3224

Facility: Otisville CF

AC No.: 04-115-19 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 6)

(drug abuse); Matter of Brant v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 236 A.D.2d 760, 761, 654 N.Y.S.2d 207, 208 (3d Dept. 1997) (history of alcohol and drug abuse); 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) (██████████); Matter of Maciag v. Hammock, 88 A.D.2d 1106, 453 N.Y.S.2d 56 (3d Dept. 1982) (problem of alcohol and drug abuse ██████████).

Insight and remorse are permissible factors. Matter of Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 478, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704 (2000); 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) (minimization of crimes); Matter of Beodeker v. Stanford, 164 A.D.3d 1555, 82 N.Y.S.3d 669 (3d Dept. 2018) (limited expression of remorse); Matter of Crawford v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 144 A.D.3d 1308, 46 N.Y.S.3d 228 (3d Dept. 2016) (lack of insight and failure to accept responsibility), lv. denied, 29 N.Y.3d 901 (2017); Matter of Phillips v. Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 23, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121 (1st Dept. 2007) (limited insight and remorse); Matter of Almeyda v. New York State Div. of Parole, 290 A.D.2d 505, 736 N.Y.S.2d 275 (2d Dept. 2002) (limited insight into why crime committed).

The Board may place greater weight on the nature of the crime without the existence of any aggravating factors. Matter of Hamilton v. New York State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714 (3d Dept. 2014).

The Board decision did not refer to any community opposition, nor did it invoke any penal philosophy, so these issues are moot.

That the Board “did not recite the precise statutory language of Executive Law § 259-i (2)(c)(A) in support of its conclusion to deny parole does not undermine its conclusion.” 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) (citation omitted); accord Matter of Reed v. Evans, 94 A.D.3d 1323, 942 N.Y.S.2d 387 (3d Dept. 2012). The language used by the Board was “only semantically different” from the statute. Matter of Miller v. New York State Div. of Parole, 72 A.D.3d 690, 691–92, 897 N.Y.S.2d 726, 727 (2d Dept. 2010); Matter of James v. Chairman of New York State Div. of Parole, 19 A.D.3d 857, 858, 796 N.Y.S.2d 735, 736 (3d Dept. 2005); see also 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) (upholding decision that denied release as “contrary to the best interest of the community”); Matter of Murray v. Evans, 83 A.D.3d 1320, 920 N.Y.S.2d 745 (3d Dept. 2011) (Board provided adequate statutory rationale).

The Board’s decision satisfied the criteria set out in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a), as it was sufficiently detailed to inform the inmate 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.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Zgaljic, John

DIN: 88-A-3224

Facility: Otisville CF

AC No.: 04-115-19 B

Findings: (Page 4 of 6)

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).

As for Appellant's complaint about lack of future guidance, the Board is not required to state what an inmate should do to improve his chances for parole in the future. Matter of Francis v. New York State Div. of Parole, 89 A.D.3d 1312, 934 N.Y.S.2d 514 (3d Dept. 2011); Matter of Freeman v. New York State Div. of Parole, 21 A.D.3d 1174, 800 N.Y.S.2d 797 (3d Dept. 2005); Matter of Partee v. Evans, 40 Misc.3d 896, 969 N.Y.S.2d 733 (Sup. Ct. Albany Co. 2013), aff'd, 117 A.D.3d 1258, 984 N.Y.S.2d 894 (3d Dept. 2014), lv. denied, 24 N.Y.3d 901, 995 N.Y.S.2d 710 (2014).

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).

Pursuant to Executive Law §259-i(2)(a), the inmate had a Parole Board Release Interview, and not a hearing. The interview is not an adversarial proceeding and there is no right to have an attorney present on behalf of the inmate. Matter of Russo v. New York State Board of Parole, 50 N.Y.2d 76, 427 N.Y.S.2d 982 (1980); Matter of Briguglio v. New York State Board of Parole, 24 N.Y.2d 21, 298 N.Y.S.2d 704 (1969); Menechino v. Oswald, 430 F.2d 403 (2d Cir. 1970); McCall v Pataki, 232 F.3d 321, 323 (2d Cir. 2000); Billiteri v. United States Bd. of Parole, 541 F.2d 938, 944-945 (2d Cir. 1976).

An inmate has no constitutional right to the information in his parole file. Billiteri v U.S. Board of Parole, 541 F.2d 938, 944-945 (2d Cir. 1976). An inmate does not have automatic access to confidential material. Matter of Perez v New York State Division of Parole, 294 A.D.2d 726, 741 N.Y.S.2d 753 (3d Dept 2002); Macklin v Travis, 274 A.D.2d 821, 711 N.Y.S.2d 915, 916 (3d Dept. 2000). The Board may consider the confidential section to the Inmate Status Report/Parole Board Report is permissible. Molinar v New York State Division of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1214, 991 N.Y.S.2d 487 (3d Dept. 2014). Per Executive Law 259-i(2)(c)(B), items submitted to the Parole Board are deemed to be confidential. Per Executive Law 259-k(2) and 9 N.Y.C.R.R.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Zgaljic, John

DIN: 88-A-3224

Facility: Otisville CF

AC No.: 04-115-19 B

Findings: (Page 5 of 6)

8000.5(c)(2)(i)(a)(b), the Parole Board is entitled to designate certain parole records as confidential. Wade v Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017).

There are no substantial evidence issues in a Parole Board Release Interview. 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 Valderrama v. Travis, 19 A.D.3d 904, 905, 796 N.Y.S.2d 758 (3d Dept. 2005); cf. Matter of Horace v. Annucci, 133 A.D.3d 1263, 20 N.Y.S.3d 492 (4th Dept. 2015).

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).

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. Parole is not constitutionally based, but is a creature of statute which may be imposed subject to conditions imposed by the state legislature. Banks v Stanford, 159 A.D.3d 134, 71 N.Y.S.3d 515 (2d Dept. 2018). The 2017 amended regulations don't create any substantive right to release, but rather, merely increase transparency in the final decision. Courts must defer to the Parole Board's interpretation of its own regulations so long as it is rational and not arbitrary nor capricious. Brown

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Zgaljic, John

DIN: 88-A-3224

Facility: Otisville CF

AC No.: 04-115-19 B

Findings: (Page 6 of 6)

v Stanford, 163 A.D.3d 1337, 82 N.Y.S.3d 622 (3d Dept. 2018); Peckham v. Calogero, 12 N.Y.3d 424, 883 N.Y.S.3d 751 (2009); Henry v. Coughlin, 214 A.D.2d 673, 625 N.Y.S.2d 578 (2d Dept. 1995). Administrative agencies are but creatures of the Legislature and are possessed only of those powers expressly or impliedly delegated by that body (Finger Lakes Racing Assn. v New York State Racing & Wagering Bd., 45 NY2d 471, 480; Matter of City of Utica v Water Pollution Control Bd., 5 NY2d 164, 168-169). So, if the 2011 Executive Law amendments don't create a constitutional liberty interest, then by definition the enacted regulations may not do so either.

The Board may consider negative aspects of the COMPAS instrument. Matter of Espinal v. New York Bd. of Parole, 2019 NY Slip Op 04080, 2019 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 4057 (3d Dept. May 23, 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 Board decision concerning the departure from the COMPAS was in compliance with the regulations. Appellant's lack of remorse, and the gravity of the crime, impacted the deprecation standard such that the departure from the COMPAS was valid.

Recommendation: Affirm.