Fordham Law School

FLASH: The Fordham Law Archive of Scholarship and History

Parole Administrative Appeal Decisions

Parole Information Project — CURRENT

Administrative Appeal Decision - Verley, Harold (2023-10-26)

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

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

ADMINISTRATIVE APPEAL DECISION NOTICE

Name:	Verley, Ha	rold	Facility:	Marcy CF	
NYSID:			Appeal Control No.:	11-047-22 B	
DIN:	19-A-4604				
Appearances:		Eve Rosahn, Esq. 125 Frenchtown Road Shohola, Pennsylvani			
Decision appealed:		October 2022 decisio months.	n, denying discre	etio ary release an imposing a hold o	of 15
Board Member(s) who participated:		Drake, Crangle, Lee			
Papers considered:		Appellant's Brief received May 16, 2023			
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 in transcript, Offender Case Plan.			
1	ermination:		and the second second	cising appealed is he coby	
Compr	hissioner	2		de novo interview Modified to	-
Comm	issioner				

If the Final Determination is at variance with Findings and Recommendation ϵ is ppeals Unit, written reasons for the Parole Board's determination <u>must</u> be annexed hereto.

This Final Determination, the related Statement of the Appeals U. .'s Findings and the separate findings of the Parole Board, if any, were mailed to the Appellant and the Appellant's Cours 1, if any, on 10/26/2023.

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

mis

STATE OF NEW YORK - BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Verley, Harold

DIN: 19-A-4604

Facility: Marcy CF

AC No.: 11-047-22 B

Findings: (Page 1 of 1)

Appellant, currently serving an aggregate indeterminate sentence of 2 years' incarceration to life as a result of his convictions for criminal possession of a forged instrument in the 2nd degree and identity theft in the 1st degree, challenges the October 2022 determination of the Board, denying release and imposing a 15-month hold. Appellant contends, among other things, that the Board failed to specify the scale of the department risk and needs assessment from which it departed and explain the reasons for its departure.

The record here reflects the Board considered appellant's COMPAS instrument. However, it appears the Board's decision – which concluded there is a reasonable probability appellant would not live and remain at liberty without violating the law – was impacted by a departure from scales in the COMPAS and the Board did not provide an adequate explanation. Under the circumstances, a de novo interview is appropriate.

In light of this recommendation that appellant receive all of the relief to which he could be entitled, appellant's remaining contentions need not be addressed.

Recommendation: Vacate and remand for de novo interview.

Mar Fi

1

11. 112