

Going No-Where Fast with Parole and Pardon Denials

11/21/08

Regardless of Nevada's current financial crisis, it boggles my mind that government agencies, especially those related to Law Enforcement continue to not only break or bend their own regulations and guidelines, but also the law, without any recourse or punishment.

Parole Board

I have heard from several institutions in this state that inmates deemed to be a 'Low Risk' to re-offend continue to receive parole denials up to three years, even when they are merely going to consecutive sentences. I can't comprehend why this state spends so much time, energy and MONEY, creating rules, regulations and laws to then dismiss them at the tax payer's expense. Each and every three year parole denial costs the state \$60,000 (an above average annual salary for ONE state worker).

The attached documentation is one example of the many parole denials I receive copies of and/or hear about. In the attached record, the inmate had a Parole Board Hearing on 9/16/08 in absence and was denied parole to his next sentence for three years.

According to his Risk Assessment he is deemed LOW Risk and was given NO reason for his denial which I thought has been a requirement for a while now. Per the NDOC website, it looks like this inmate has two more sentences to serve time on.

I don't understand why inmates who are disciplinary write-up free, ARE programming, are deemed a LOW RISK by the Parole Board, are just going to consecutive sentences, are being denied, much less for three years. I have heard from far too many inmates that they are getting maximum dumps despite having a 'low risk' score for the public not to question.

What kind of message does this send to a criminal? Do well, you will get a low risk assessment, but you will get the maximum dump anyway....? What reasons are they given to continue to do well in prison, OR even when they get out?

If the inmates are going to another sentence and not getting the opportunity to re-offend anyway, what purpose does it serve to deny them from going to a consecutive sentence, ESPECIALLY if they are doing well, write-up free and programming?

Pardon's Board

I have wrote and spoke about the lack of adherence to the Nevada Administrative Code that requires TWO, not ONE, Pardon's Board Hearings per year, many times and in many forums. I was pleased that finally a Pardon's Board Hearing was scheduled before this years end, however extremely bewildered by the decisions.

It is my understanding that the method in which an inmate is granted a Pardon's Board Hearing is to be sponsored by a member of the Pardon's Board or by the Director of the Nevada Department of Corrections. If this is true, then I am curious as to why there were so many unanimous denials to grant the slightest bit of clemency. I would assume that there would be at least one vote to grant clemency from the individual who requested the inmate be granted a hearing. I can't help but think that this is yet another form of cruel and sick punishment for these fellow humans to give them a glimmer of hope and then crush that hope as if it were an annoying bug.

It is no secret that Nevada is in financial hardship. With the majority of the only 15 inmates who were seen by the last Pardon's Board being denied, it seems to me that the Pardon's Board Hearing itself cost the state more money then it saved by granting any clemency at all, which is quite a disappointment for tax payers who are losing their jobs, homes, and community/social services every day.

Proposal for Parole

Re-review ALL past parole denial decisions for 'Low Risk' offenders who are still incarcerated and grant them, especially if they are institutional and only being granted to go to a consecutive sentence. This could be done quietly and by a clerk level position. I believe the state of California has done this in the past during financial crisis. To not grant parole to a 'Low Risk' offender makes the title/assessment meaningless.

Proposal for Pardon's Board

Follow the law and have two hearings a year so it's not so disgraceful that the Governor, Supreme Court Justices and the Attorney General aren't judging those who can't even follow the law themselves.

Chose applicants who actually may be granted clemency rather than bring them up for public humiliation only to further punish them for crimes they committed decades ago.

Teresa Werner
P.O. Box 60436
Reno, NV 89506

STATE OF NEVADA

7C 3C

WHITE - Board File PINK - 1st File
CANARY - Remits GOLDENROD - P&P

cc#: 226739

CERTIFICATION OF BOARD OF PAROLE COMMISSIONERS ACTION

09-16-2008

ORDER DENYING PAROLE RELEASE

JORDAN, CLINT

INMATE NAME

096152

IDOP NUMBER

High Desert State Prison

LOCATION OF HEARING

It is the order of the Board that further consideration of parole is DENIED until ---: 11-01-2011

A hearing to reconsider parole will be scheduled approximately four months prior to the date specified above.

Connie S. Butler

FOR THE NEVADA BOARD OF PAROLE COMMISSIONERS

Recommendation of panel present:

Commissioner M. Keeler: DENY

Commissioner E. Gray: DENY

The final action was ratified by the following parole commissioners:

Commissioner M. Silva: DENY

Commissioner E. Gray: DENY

Commissioner _____ GRANT DENY

Commissioner _____ GRANT DENY

Commissioner M. Keeler: DENY

Commissioner *CPB* GRANT DENY

Commissioner _____ GRANT DENY

STATE OF NEVADA

WHITE - Board File CANARY - inmate
PIHK - 1st File
GOLDENROD - P&P

BOARD OF PAROLE COMMISSIONERS PAROLE RISK ASSESSMENT

JORDAN, CLINT

NAME

098152

IDOP#

09-16-2008

DATE

High Desert State Prison

INSTITUTION

Static Risk Factors

Age at First Arrest (juvenile or adult)

20-24 Years

1

Prior Probation/Parole Revocations

No Probation or Parole Revocations

0

Employment History

Satisfactory FT employment 1-2 years

0

Offenses for Current or Prior Convictions

Auto Theft, Burglary, Forgery, Robbery

2

History of Drug/Alcohol Abuse

Same use, no severe disruption of functioning

1

Gender

MALE

1

STATIC RISK SCORE

5

Crime Severity Level

High

Dynamic Risk Factors

Current Age

31-40

0

Active Gang Membership

0

Completed DOC certified educational vocational or treatment program

Yes, or has GED/HS Dip/Degree

-1

Disciplinary Conduct - past year

No Majors or Single Minor

-1

Current Custody Level

Medium

0

DYNAMIC RISK SCORE

-2

TOTAL SCORE (static & dynamic)

3

Risk Level

Low

Guideline Recommendation: Parole at 1st or 2nd Hearing

AGGRAVATING FACTORS - The Board determined the following aggravating factors are applicable in your case:

MITIGATING FACTORS - The Board determined the following mitigating factors are applicable in your case:

CENTRAL OFFICE

1677 Old Hot Springs Road
Suite A
Carson City, Nevada 89706-0677
<http://parole.nv.gov>
(775) 687-5049
Fax (775) 687-6736

DORLA M. SALLING, *Chairman*
CONNIE S. BISBEE, *Member*
THOMAS D. GOODSON, *Member*
MARY VIETH, *Member*

CHRIS MOLNAR, *Executive Secretary*

STATE OF NEVADA

JIM GIBBONS
Governor



LAS VEGAS OFFICE

4000 S. Eastern Avenue
Suite 130
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-0840
<http://parole.nv.gov>
(702) 486-4370
Fax (702) 486-4376

DORLA M. SALLING, *Chairman*
EDDIE GRAY JR., *Member*
MICHAEL KEELER, *Member*
MAURICE SILVA, *Member*

NEVADA BOARD OF PAROLE COMMISSIONERS

Addendum to Order Denying Parole

<u>Jordan, Clint</u>	<u>96152</u>	<u>HDSP</u>	<u>9-16-08</u>
Name	ID #	Location	Date

Pursuant to Nevada Law, the Parole Board is required to provide specific recommendations to improve the possibility of granting parole the next time you are considered for parole, if any.

The following recommendations do not create a liberty interest when you are considered for parole in the future. While the suggestions that are provided may improve the possibility of being granted parole in the future, they do not guarantee that you will be granted parole.

The specific recommendations pertaining to your case are indicated.

- ☒ 1. Do not engage in disciplinary misconduct during denial period.
- ☒ 2. Participate in programs that address the behaviors that led to your incarceration.
- ☐ 3. Participate in educational or vocational programs that will improve your marketability in the workplace upon released.
- ☐ 4. Participate in victim empathy programming.
- ☐ 5. Disassociate from involvement with a gang.
- ☐ 6. Other: _____

- ☐ 7. Other: _____

Request To Appeal Parole hearing Decision To The Board of Commissioners

This is a formal Request To appeal your decision To Deny my parole on 09-16-2008 untill 11-01-2011

I belive my Dew process Rights have been violated also I Belive my equal protection wrights are also In Violation.

On 9-16-2008 I was seen by The parole Board in absence. In your denial papers There is no explanation as To your decision. According To your chart I am a Low Risk, The Recomendation was for parole on first or second hearing. Deneying my parole untill 2011 is an unfair decision.

I have been Wright up free for my entire Time incarcerated. I have been working for approxamthly 16 months. I have been programing my entire Time!

The message you are sending is That programing means nothing To you or on your decisions.

ON The Papers I recived Their are Two Factor Sections Aggravating factors, and Mitigating factors. Their are no Comments on eather of These Sections.

I belive you are Required by law To give an explanation

for Denying a parole.

I do have a support system on the outside.
My wife Shelly.

She is my only reason for programing and with
her help I Believe I can be a productive member
of society! one day

Thank you for your Time

Clint A Jordan
#96152