

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 - Wright, Thomas L (2022-03-30)

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

Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Wright, Thomas L (2022-03-30)" (2023). Parole Information Project
<https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/1443>

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: Wright, Thomas

DIN: 88-C-0900

Facility: Eastern NY CF

AC No.: 09-130-21 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 6)

Appellant challenges the September 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 12-month hold. Appellant's instant offense consisted of him traveling to New York State with the purpose of finding and killing his ex-wife. And when he found her, stabbing her to death and trying to leave evidence to place the blame on someone else. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the Board failed to consider and/or properly weigh the required statutory factors. 2) the decision is based upon personal opinion. 3) the decision lacks detail. 4) the decision was predetermined. 5) some of the Commissioners were on prior panels. 6) the decision is based upon erroneous information, as appellant never stalked his wife, never abused his wife before, and doesn't have a history of drug abuse. 7) the community opposition has errors in it. 8) several documents, including victim impact statements, were not either fully turned over, or turned over at all. 9) release can't be denied due to victim impact statements. 10) the Board failed to comply with the 2011 amendments to the Executive Law, and the 2017 regulations, in that the positive portions of the COMPAS were ignored, and the COMPAS departure was illegally done as no individualized and specific scales were mentioned.

Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A) requires the Board to consider factors 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 Schendel v. Stanford, 185 A.D.3d 1365, 1366, 126 N.Y.S.3d 428, 429 (3rd Dept. 2020); Matter of Campbell v. Stanford, 173 A.D.3d 1012, 1015, 105 N.Y.S.3d 461 (2d Dept. 2019); Matter of Phillips v. Dennison, 41 A.D.3d 17, 21, 834 N.Y.S.2d 121, 124 (1st Dept. 2007).

The Board was not required to give each factor equal weight and could place greater emphasis on the severity of his crime and the attendant circumstances. The Board was persuaded by the "horrific crimes." In view of this, the decision was not irrational bordering on impropriety. Matter of Beodeker v. Stanford, 164 A.D.3d 1555, 82 N.Y.S.3d 669 (3d Dept. 2018); Payne v Stanford, 173 A.D.3d 1577, 104 N.Y.S.3d 383 (3d Dept. 2019).

The Board may consider the brutality and depravity 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; Borcsock v New York State Division of Parole, 34 A.D.3d 961, 823 N.Y.S.2d 310 lv. den. 8

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Wright, Thomas

DIN: 88-C-0900

Facility: Eastern NY CF

AC No.: 09-130-21 B

Findings: (Page 2 of 6)

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).

The fact that the incarcerated individual committed the instant offense while on community supervision is a proper basis for denying parole release. See, e.g., Matter of Byas v. Fischer, 120 A.D.3d 1586-87, 1586, 992 N.Y.S.2d 813, 814 (4th Dept. 2014); Matter of Thompson v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 120 A.D.3d 1518, 1518-19, 992 N.Y.S.2d 464, 465 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Guzman v. Dennison, 32 A.D.3d 798, 799, 821 N.Y.S.2d 208, 208 (1st Dept. 2006).

The Board may cite the failure of the inmate to acknowledge the impact of the criminal conduct on the victim. Gaito v New York State Board of Parole, 238 A.D.2d 634, 655 N.Y.S.2d 692 (3d Dept 1997); Romer v Dennison, 24 A.D.3d 866, 804 N.Y.S.2d 872 (3d Dept. 2005).

“[T]here is a strong rehabilitative component in the statute that may be given effect by considering insight.” Matter of Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 478, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704 (2000). The Board may consider the lack of insight. Crawford v New York State Board of Parole, 144 A.D.3d 1308, 46 N.Y.S.3d 228 (3d Dept. 2016). And that his insight was limited. Pulliam v Board of Parole, 197 A.D.3d 1495, 153 N.Y.S.3d 704 (3d Dept. 2021).

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 a district attorney’s recommendation to deny 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 Porter v. Alexander, 63 A.D.3d 945, 881 N.Y.S.2d 157 (2d Dept. 2009); Matter of Walker v. Travis, 252 A.D.2d 360, 676 N.Y.S.2d 52 (1st Dept. 1998); Matter of Walker v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 218 A.D.2d 891, 630 N.Y.S.2d 417 (3d Dept. 1995); Matter of Williams v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 220 A.D.2d 753, 633 N.Y.S.2d 182 (2d Dept. 1995); Matter of Confoy v. New York State Div. of Parole, 173 A.D.2d 1014, 569 N.Y.S.2d 846, 847 (3d Dept. 1991); Matter of Lynch v. New York State Div. of Parole, 82 A.D.2d 1012, 442 N.Y.S.2d 179 (3d Dept. 1981).

As for community opposition, the Board may receive and consider written communications from individuals, other than those specifically identified in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A), opposing an incarcerated individual’s release to parole supervision. 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) (recognizing letters in support and in opposition to release as relevant considerations); Matter of Applewhite v. New York State Bd. of Parole, 167 A.D.3d 1380, 91 N.Y.S.3d 308, 311 (3d Dept. 2018) (“Contrary to petitioner’s contention, we do not find that [the Board’s] consideration of certain unspecified ‘consistent community opposition’ to his parole release was outside the scope of the relevant statutory factors that may be taken into account in rendering a parole release determination”),

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Wright, Thomas

DIN: 88-C-0900

Facility: Eastern NY CF

AC No.: 09-130-21 B

Findings: (Page 3 of 6)

appeal dismissed, 32 N.Y.3d 1219 (2019); Matter of Clark v. New York Bd. of Parole, 166 A.D.3d 531, 89 N.Y.S.3d 134 (1st Dept. 2018) (“the Board permissibly considered letters in opposition to the parole application submitted by public officials and members of the community”); Matter of Rivera v. Stanford, 53 N.Y.S.3d 404, 149 A.D.3d 1445 (3d Dept. 2017), aff’g Matter of Rivera v. Evans, Index No. 0603-16, *Decision & Order* dated July 5, 2016 (Sup. Ct. Sullivan Co.)(LaBuda A.J.S.C.) (recognizing “[c]onsideration of community or other opposition was proper under the statute”); Matter of Grigger v. New York State Div. of Parole, 11 A.D.3d 850, 852–53, 783 N.Y.S.2d 689, 691 (3d Dept. 2004) (recognizing 259-i(2)(c)(A)(v)’s list is not the exclusive information the Board may consider and persons in addition to victims and their families may submit letters), lv. denied, 4 N.Y.3d 704, 792 N.Y.S.2d 1 (2005). The same has also long been recognized as true with respect to letters supporting an incarcerated individual’s potential parole release. See, e.g., Matter of Hamilton v. New York State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d at 1273, 990 N.Y.S.2d at 719 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of Gaston v. Berbary, 16 A.D.3d 1158, 1159, 791 N.Y.S.2d 781, 782 (4th Dept. 2005); Matter of Torres v. New York State Div. of Parole, 300 A.D.2d 128, 129, 750 N.Y.S.2d 759, 760 (1st Dept. 2002); Matter of Walker v. Travis, 252 A.D.2d 360, 362, 676 N.Y.S.2d 52, 54 (1st Dept. 1998); cf. Cardenales v. Dennison, 37 A.D.3d 371, 371, 830 N.Y.S.2d 152, 153 (1st Dept. 2007) (Board permissibly determined offense outweighed other positive factors including letters of support from, among others, victim’s mother). Indeed, 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8000.5(c)(2) refers to the security of letters either in support of or in opposition to an incarcerated individual’s release.

The Board’s decision satisfied the criteria set out in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a), 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 decision is not based in any way upon personal opinion.

Appellant’s stalking, spousal abuse and drug abuse are all described in the PSI and in the sentencing minutes. Pursuant to Executive Law sections 259-i(2)(c)(A) and 259-k(1), the Board is required to obtain official reports and may rely on the information contained therein. See, e.g., Matter of Silmon v. Travis, 95 N.Y.2d 470, 474, 477, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704, 706, 708 (2000) (discussing former status report); Matter of Carter v. Evans, 81 A.D.3d 1031, 916 N.Y.S.2d 291 (3d Dept.) (presentence investigation report), lv. denied, 16 N.Y.3d 712, 923 N.Y.S.2d 416 (2011); see also Billiteri v. United States Bd. of Parole, 541 F.2d 938, 944-945 (2d Cir. 1976). To the extent Appellant contends the Board relied on erroneous information in the pre-sentence report, this is not the proper forum to raise the issue. Any challenge to the pre-sentence report must be

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Wright, Thomas

DIN: 88-C-0900

Facility: Eastern NY CF

AC No.: 09-130-21 B

Findings: (Page 4 of 6)

made to the original sentencing court. Matter of Delrosario v. Stanford, 140 A.D.3d 1515, 34 N.Y.S.3d 696 (3d Dept. 2016); Matter of Wisniewski v. Michalski, 114 A.D.3d 1188, 979 N.Y.S.2d 745 (4th Dept. 2014); Matter of Vigliotti v. State, 98 A.D.3d 789, 950 N.Y.S.2d 619 (3d Dept. 2012). The Board is mandated to consider the report and is entitled to rely on the information contained in the report. Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A); 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.2(d)(7); Matter of Carter v. Evans, 81 A.D.3d 1031, 1031, 916 N.Y.S.2d 291, 293 (3d Dept.), lv. denied, 16 N.Y.3d 712, 923 N.Y.S.2d 416 (2011).

There is no evidence the Board's decision was predetermined based upon the instant offense. Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Hakim-Zaki v. New York State Div. of Parole, 29 A.D.3d 1190, 814 N.Y.S.2d 414 (3d Dept. 2006); Matter of Guerin v. New York State Div. of Parole, 276 A.D.2d 899, 695 N.Y.S.2d 622 (3d Dept. 2000).

No constitutional or statutory right of petitioner is violated because a Parole Board member involved in the immediate Board decision took part in a prior Board decision against the inmate. DiChiaro v Hammock, 87 A.D.2d 957, 451 N.Y.S.2d 248 (3d Dept 1982); Payne v Stanford, 173 A.D.3d 1577, 104 N.Y.S.3d 383 (3d Dept. 2019).

An incarcerated individual 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), and generally is not entitled to confidential material, Matter of Justice v. Comm'r of New York State Dep't of Corr. & Cmty. Supervision, 130 A.D.3d 1342, 15 N.Y.S.3d 853 (3d Dept. 2015); Matter of Perez v. New York State Div. of Parole, 294 A.D.2d 726, 741 N.Y.S.2d 753 (3d Dept. 2002); Matter of Macklin v. Travis, 274 A.D.2d 821, 711 N.Y.S.2d 915, 916 (3d Dept. 2000). The Board may consider confidential information. Matter of Molinar v. New York State Div. of Parole, 119 A.D.3d 1214, 991 N.Y.S.2d 487 (3d Dept. 2014). The Board may designate certain parole records as confidential. See Matter of Wade v. Stanford, 148 A.D.3d 1487, 52 N.Y.S.3d 508 (3d Dept. 2017) (citing Public Officers Law § 87(2)(a), (f); Executive Law § 259-k(2); 9 N.Y.C.R.R. 8000.5(c)(2)(i)(a), (b)).

That statements submitted to the Board by members of the public might contain erroneous information is irrelevant. Statements may contain raw emotions of a close-knit family traumatized by a depraved and senseless murder. These submissions can also be emotional and touch upon inappropriate matters. Such fact does not require the Parole Board to expressly disavow in its decision inappropriate matters interjected by victims or to somehow quantify the extent or degree to which it considered appropriate parts of victim's statements while disregarding other parts in its overall analysis of the statutory factors. The Board's decision will be upheld if there is nothing indicating it was influenced by, placed weigh upon, or relied upon any improper matter. Duffy v New York State Department of Corrections and Community Supervision, 132 A.D.3d 1207, 19 N.Y.S.3d 610 (3d Dept. 2015).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Wright, Thomas

DIN: 88-C-0900

Facility: Eastern NY CF

AC No.: 09-130-21 B

Findings: (Page 5 of 6)

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); Bocadisi 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 Board is not required to give the COMPAS and case plan greater weight than the other statutory factors. Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); accord Matter of Lewis v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1478, 59 N.Y.S.3d 726 (3d Dept. 2017). The Board still is entitled to place greater emphasis on the instant offense. See Matter of Montane v. Evans, 116 A.D.3d 197, 203, 981 N.Y.S.2d 866, 871 (3d Dept. 2014); see also Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Lewis v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1478, 59 N.Y.S.3d 726 (3d Dept. 2017). Notably, the 2011 amendments did not change the three substantive standards that the Board is required to apply when deciding whether to grant parole, namely (1) whether "there is a reasonable probability that, if such incarcerated individual is released, he will live and remain at liberty without violating the law"; (2) whether release "is not incompatible with the welfare of society"; and (3) whether release "will not so deprecate the seriousness of his crime as to undermine respect for law." Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A). Even uniformly low COMPAS scores and other evidence of rehabilitation would not resolve the broader questions of society's welfare, public perceptions of the seriousness of a crime, or whether release would undermine respect for the law. Thus, the COMPAS cannot mandate a particular result, and declining to afford the COMPAS controlling weight does not violate the 2011 amendments. Matter of King v. Stanford, 137 A.D.3d 1396, 26 N.Y.S.3d 815 (3d Dept. 2016). 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).

The Board considered the COMPAS instrument and did not depart from it. That is, the decision was not impacted by a departure from a scale. Notice of Adoption, NY Reg, Sept. 27, 2017 at 2. For example, the Board did not find a reasonable probability that Petitioner will not live and remain at liberty without violating the law but rather concluded, *despite* low risk scores, release would be

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Wright, Thomas

DIN: 88-C-0900

Facility: Eastern NY CF

AC No.: 09-130-21 B

Findings: (Page 6 of 6)

inappropriate under the other two statutory standards. This is entirely consistent with the Board's intention in enacting the amended regulation. And the Board decision listed many reasons why they came to that conclusion.

Recommendation: Affirm.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Wright, Thomas **Facility:** Eastern NY CF
NYSID: [REDACTED] **Appeal Control No.:** 09-130-21 B
DIN: 88-C-0900

Appearances: Martha Raynor Esq.
Lincoln Square Legal Services
150 West 62nd Street
9th Floor
New York, New York 10023

Decision appealed: September 2021 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 12 months.

Board Member(s) who participated: Cruse, Agostini, Segarra

Papers considered: Appellant’s Brief received January 14, 2022

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:

 Cheryl L. [unclear] Commissioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed <input type="checkbox"/> Vacated, remanded for de novo interview <input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
 Michael [unclear] Commissioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed <input type="checkbox"/> Vacated, remanded for de novo interview <input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____
 [unclear] Commissioner	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Affirmed <input type="checkbox"/> Vacated, remanded for de novo interview <input type="checkbox"/> Modified to _____

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

03/30/2022 66

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