

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 - Sanchez, German (2022-03-14)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Sanchez, German (2022-03-14)" (2023). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/1440>

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: Sanchez, German

DIN: 18-B-1123

Facility: Cayuga CF

AC No.: 09-087-21 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 3)

Appellant is serving an aggregate sentence of four years, two months, and sixteen days to eight years upon his conviction by plea to two counts of Aggravated Family Offense. In the instant offense, the Appellant engaged in a verbal and physical altercation wherein he placed his hands around the victim's neck and applied pressure, while also telling her that he would hurt her if she left him. Thereafter, he violated the Order of Protection by calling the victim thirty-eight different times. The Appellant challenges the August 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 24-month hold on the following grounds: (1) the Board disregarded the Appellant's release plans; and (4)) the Board failed to rebut the presumption of release created by the receipt of an Earned Eligibility Certificate ("EEC"); (2) the Board denied release based on the Appellant's criminal history; (3) the Board failed to consider other factors such as the Appellant's institutional accomplishments and programming; and (3) the Board disregarded the Appellant's release plans.

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). In this case, Appellant received an Earned Eligibility Certificate ("EEC"), therefore the deprecation standard does not apply here.

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

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Sanchez, German

DIN: 18-B-1123

Facility: Cayuga CF

AC No.: 09-087-21 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 3)

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.

An EEC does not automatically entitle an incarcerated individual to discretionary release or eliminate consideration of the statutory factors including the instant offense. Matter of Corley v. New York State Div. of Parole, 33 A.D.3d 1142, 1143, 822 N.Y.S.2d 817, 818 (3d Dept. 2006); Matter of Pearl v. New York State Div. of Parole, 25 A.D.3d 1058, 808 N.Y.S.2d 816, 817 (3d Dept. 2006); Matter of White v. Dennison, 29 A.D.3d 1144, 814 N.Y.S.2d 393 (3d Dept. 2006). Moreover, the Board is not required to give each factor equal weight. Matter of Corley, 33 A.D.3d 1142, 1143, 822 N.Y.S.2d 817, 818; Matter of Pearl, 25 A.D.3d 1058, 808 N.Y.S.2d 816, 817. The Board may deny release to parole on a finding that there is a reasonable probability that, if such incarcerated individual is released, the individual will not live and remain at liberty without violating the law and that her release is not compatible with the welfare of society. Correction Law § 805; Matter of Heitman v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 214 A.D.2d 673, 625 N.Y.S.2d 264 (2d Dept. 1995); Matter of Salcedo v. Ross, 183 A.D.2d 771, 771, 583 N.Y.S.2d 502, 503 (2d Dept. 1992); Matter of Walker v. Russi, 176 A.D.2d 1185, 576 N.Y.S.2d 51 (3d Dept. 1991), appeal dismissed, 79 N.Y.2d 89 7, 581 N.Y.S.2d 660 (1992).

The record as a whole, including the interview transcript, reflects that the Board considered the appropriate factors, including Appellant's instant offense of two counts of Aggravated Family Offenses and Appellant's extensive criminal history. The Appellant was under parole supervision at the time of the instant offense. Appellant's criminal history includes six previous felony convictions (exclusive of the instant offenses), five previous NYS DOCCS terms (exclusive of the instant term), and six misdemeanor convictions. These convictions are for drugs possession and sales, property, weapons, and domestic violence. The Appellant also has also been the subject of several domestic incident reports which resulted in past and active Orders of Protection. In addition, the Board also considered the Appellant's disciplinary record which included a violent conduct infraction in 2018 and most recently in February of 2021.

The Appellant's COMPAS instrument was considered and indicated a medium abscond risk, high history of violence, high prison misconduct, and highly probably reentry substance abuse. The Board reviewed and considered Appellant's case plan and determined it was insufficient to assist the Appellant in his much-needed rehabilitation.

While the Appellant contends that the Board failed to consider his programming achievements or explore how programming helped him achieve his rehabilitation goals, a review of the file indicates that the Appellant had not completed programming. The Appellant was

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Sanchez, German

DIN: 18-B-1123

Facility: Cayuga CF

AC No.: 09-087-21 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 3)

removed from ██████ for fighting (and recently returned), and at the time of the interview was on the waitlist for school, ART and Transitional Services 2 & 3. Additionally, while the Board discussed with the Appellant his employment options upon release, these plans were vague, and the Appellant lacked any letters of assurance. The Board also had before it and considered the PSI and sentencing minutes.

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 Appellant's prior unlawful behavior, including his failure on community supervision, as well as his history of drug abuse and domestic violence, representing an inability or unwillingness to fully comply with the law. 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. Yates v. Walters, 111 A.D.2d 839, 839, 490 N.Y.S.2d 573, 575 (2d Dept. 1985); 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). The Board also cited the COMPAS instrument's elevated scores for risk of absconding and criminal involvement, as well as the elevated score for reentry substance abuse. The Board acted within its discretion in determining these considerations rebutted any presumption created by the EEC and rendered discretionary release inappropriate at this time. See generally Matter of Neal v. Stanford, 131 A.D.3d 1320, 16 N.Y.S.3d 342 (3d Dept. 2015).

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 factfinders. 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).

In conclusion, Appellant 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, 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)).

Recommendation: Affirm.

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Sanchez, German Facility: Cayuga CF
NYSID: [REDACTED] Appeal Control No.: 09-087-21 B
DIN: 18-B-1123

Appearances: Ryan James Muldoon, Esq.
126 Genesee Street, Suite 105
Auburn, NY 13021

Decision appealed: August 2021 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 24 months.

Board Member(s) who participated: Demosthenes, Crangle, Mitchell

Papers considered: Appellant’s Brief received December 15, 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

03/14/2022 