

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Porter, Anthony

DIN: 14-A-0205

Facility: Clinton CF

AC No.: 04-045-19 R

Findings: (Page 1 of 2)

Appellant challenges the March 20, 2019 determination of the administrative law judge (“ALJ”), revoking release and imposing a 13-month time assessment.

Appellant is serving a determinate sentence of 4 years with 5 years post-release supervision after having been convicted of Burglary 2nd.

Eleven parole violation charges were brought against Appellant involving marijuana use without proper medical authorization, prohibited consumption of alcohol, numerous curfew violations, and threatening the safety or wellbeing of others by choking and striking another person. At the final revocation hearing, Appellant entered a plea of guilty to using marijuana without proper medical authorization.

Appellant raises the following issues in his brief: (1) he is rehabilitated and should have been released back into the community; and (2) the 13-month hold was excessive.

As to issues one and two, Appellant’s parole was revoked at the hearing upon his unconditional plea of guilty. Appellant was represented by counsel at the final hearing, and the Administrative Law Judge explained the substance of the plea agreement. The guilty plea was entered into knowingly, intelligently and voluntarily, and is therefore valid. Matter of Steele v. New York State Div. of Parole, 123 A.D.3d 1170, 998 N.Y.S.2d 244 (3d Dept. 2014); Matter of James v. Chairman of N.Y. State Bd. of Parole, 106 A.D.3d 1300, 965 N.Y.S.2d 235 (3d Dept. 2013); Matter of Ramos v. New York State Div. of Parole, 300 A.D.2d 852, 853, 752 N.Y.S.2d 159 (3d Dept. 2002). Consequently, his guilty plea forecloses this challenge. See Matter of Steele, 123 A.D.3d 1170, 998 N.Y.S.2d 244; Matter of Gonzalez v. Artus, 107 A.D.3d 1568, 1569, 966 N.Y.S.2d 710, 711 (4th Dept. 2013).

In addition, Appellant did not preserve any of the issues he now raises in his brief, and they have therefore been waived. See 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §8006.3(b); Matter of Worrell v. Stanford, 153 A.D.3d 1510, 59 N.Y.S.3d 922 (3d Dept. 2017); Matter of Bowes v. Dennison, 20 A.D.3d 845, 800 N.Y.S.2d 459 (3d Dept. 2005); Matter of Currie v. New York State Board of Parole, 298 A.D.2d 805, 748 N.Y.S.2d 712 (3d Dept. 2002).

Appellant is a Category 1 violator and, therefore, the ALJ must impose a minimum time assessment of 15 months, or a hold to the maximum expiration date of Appellant’s sentence, whichever is less. The ALJ may in certain cases reduce the minimum 15-month time assessment by up to three months, and this was part of the stipulated settlement made on the record at the final revocation hearing. See 9 N.Y.C.R.R. §8005.20(c)(1). The 13-month time assessment imposed by

STATE OF NEW YORK – BOARD OF PAROLE

APPEALS UNIT FINDINGS & RECOMMENDATION

Name: Porter, Anthony

DIN: 14-A-0205

Facility: Clinton CF

AC No.: 04-045-19 R

Findings: (Page 2 of 2)

the ALJ at the final revocation hearing was agreed to on the record by both Appellant and his attorney without objection, and was not excessive as the Executive Law does not place an outer limit on the length of the time assessment that may be imposed. Matter of Washington v. Annucci, 144 A.D.3d 1541, 41 N.Y.S.3d 808 (4th Dept. 2016); Matter of Wilson v. Evans, 104 A.D.3d 1190, 1191, 960 N.Y.S.2d 807, 809 (4th Dept. 2013); Murchison v. New York State Div. of Parole, 91 A.D.3d 1005, 1005, 935 N.Y.S.2d 741, 742 (3d Dept. 2012).

Recommendation: Affirm.