

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 - Stevens, James M (2022-03-30)

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

"Administrative Appeal Decision - Stevens, James M (2022-03-30)" (2023). Parole Information Project <https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/aad/1473>

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](mailto:tmelnick@law.fordham.edu).

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Stevens, James

**DIN:** 01-A-6654

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 11-119-21 B

**Findings:** (Page 1 of 3)

---

Appellant challenges the November 2021 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 18-month hold. Appellant is incarcerated for two instant offenses. In one, Appellant caused the death of the victim by shooting him in the head during a robbery. In the second, while incarcerated, Appellant was found with a 7-inch toothbrush with a razor blade melted into the head. Appellant raises the following issues: 1) the Board denied parole based on the nature of the crime without citing any aggravating circumstances; 2) the Board denied release despite his low COMPAS scores; 3) the Board did not recommend what Appellant should do to improve his chances for parole in the future; 4) the Board mischaracterized his apology letter as superficial; and 5) the decision lacked specificity and did not clarify the reasons for denying parole. These arguments are without merit.

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).

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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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 (4<sup>th</sup> 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.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Stevens, James

**DIN:** 01-A-6654

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 11-119-21 B

**Findings:** (Page 2 of 3)

---

The record as a whole, including the interview transcript, reflects that the Board considered the appropriate factors, including: the instant offense of Murder in the second degree and Attempted Promoting Prison Contraband in the first degree; Appellant's criminal history including two prior robbery convictions and failure while on probation supervision; Appellant's institutional efforts featuring completion of recommended programs including ██████, ART and vocational training, receipt of a high school diploma, and numerous misbehavior reports including tickets for creating a disturbance, weapon, and drug use; and release plans to transfer to Tennessee to live with his fiancée. The Board also had before it and considered, among other things, the COMPAS instrument, the case plan, the sentencing minutes, a letter from the District Attorney, and Appellant's parole packet featuring a résumé, release plans, an apology letter to the victim's family, a commendation letter, and letters of support from family and an employment agency.

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 instant offenses representing a continuation of Appellant's criminal history, Appellant's poor disciplinary record while incarcerated, and Appellant's lack of remorse. See Matter of Campbell v. Stanford, 173 A.D.3d 1012, 1016, 105 N.Y.S.3d 461, 465 (2d Dept. 2019); Matter of Kirkpatrick v. Travis, 5 A.D.3d 385, 772 N.Y.S.2d 540 (2d Dept. 2004); 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 Silmon v. Travis, 266 A.D.2d 296, 297, 698 N.Y.S.2d 685, 686 (2d Dept. 1999), aff'd 95 N.Y.2d 470, 478, 718 N.Y.S.2d 704 (2000). While the Board does not agree that aggravating factors are always required to support emphasis on an incarcerated individual's offense, Matter of Hamilton, 119 A.D.3d 1268, 990 N.Y.S.2d 714, the Board's decision here was based on the additional considerations outlined above.

Appellant's contention that the Board denied release despite his low COMPAS scores is without merit. The 2011 amendments require procedures incorporating risk and needs principles to "assist" the Board in making parole release decisions. Executive Law § 259-c(4). The Board satisfies this requirement in part by using the COMPAS instrument. Matter of Montane v. Evans, 116 A.D.3d 197, 202, 981 N.Y.S.2d 866, 870 (3d Dept. 2014); see also Matter of Hawthorne v. Stanford, 135 A.D.3d 1036, 1042, 22 N.Y.S.3d 640, 645 (3d Dept. 2016); 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 Robles v. Fischer, 117 A.D.3d 1558, 1559, 985 N.Y.S.2d 386, 387 (4th Dept. 2014). This is encompassed in the Board's regulations. 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.2(a). However, the COMPAS is not predictive and was never intended to be the sole indicator of risk and needs as the Board gets risk and needs information from a variety of sources, including the statutory factors and the interview. Notably, the 2011 amendments did not eliminate the requirement that the Board conduct a case-by-case

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

**APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION**

**Name:** Stevens, James

**DIN:** 01-A-6654

**Facility:** Fishkill CF

**AC No.:** 11-119-21 B

**Findings:** (Page 3 of 3)

---

review of each incarcerated individual by considering the statutory factors including the instant offense. The amendments also did not change the three substantive standards that the Board is required to apply when deciding whether to grant parole. Executive Law § 259-i(2)(c)(A). Thus, the COMPAS cannot mandate a particular result. Matter of King v. Stanford, 137 A.D.3d 1396, 26 N.Y.S.3d 815 (3d Dept. 2016). Rather, 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); see also Matter of Gonzalvo v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1021, 56 N.Y.S.3d 896 (3d Dept. 2017). That is exactly what occurred here.

As for Appellant's complaint about lack of future guidance, the Board is not required to state what an incarcerated individual 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).

Inasmuch as Appellant disputes the Board's finding that his apology letter was superficial, it was well within the Board's authority to make an assessment of Appellant's credibility. Matter of Siao-Pao v. Dennison, 51 A.D.3d 105, 108, 854 N.Y.S.2d 348, 351 (1st Dept.), aff'd, 11 N.Y.3d 777, 866 N.Y.S.2d 602 (2008).

Finally, the Board's decision satisfied the criteria set out in Executive Law § 259-i(2)(a) and 9 N.Y.C.R.R. § 8002.3(b), 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 Board addressed many of the factors and principles considered in individualized terms and explained those that ultimately weighed most heavily in its deliberations.

**Recommendation:** Affirm.

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name: Stevens, James

Facility: Fishkill CF

NYSID: [REDACTED]

Appeal Control No.: 11-119-21 B

DIN: 01-A-6654

Appearances: James Stevens, 01-A-6654  
Fishkill Correctional Facility  
P.O. Box 1245  
Beacon, NY 12508

Decision appealed: November 2021 decision, denying discretionary release and imposing a hold of 18 months.

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

Papers considered: Appellant's Letter-brief received January 24, 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:

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

03/30/2022 66

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