

**Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
MEETING OF January 29, 2015**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison,, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

L13943 DWAYNE ROBY
C02117 OSCAR CURTIS
L10298 DWIGHT JOHNSON
C86186 WILLIAM HOWELL
C01657 HENRY DEE
C63379 EDDIE DRIVER
C63921 MICHAEL BAPTIST

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Monreal
Roll call was taken by the Recording Secretary: Kelly Knappmeyer

MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Angela Blackman-Donovan	X	
Ed Bowers	X	
Edith Crigler	X	
Salvador Diaz	X	
Craig Findley	X	
Eric Gregg	X	
Vonetta Harris	X	
Tom Johnson	X	
William Norton	X	
Jennifer Parrack	X	
Donald Shelton	X	
Adam Monreal	X	

12 Present

The Recording Secretary presented the following minutes for approval:
Open Session Minutes from December 2014. (ADM - SD) Leave

Motion to continue George Peter to March 2015 En Banc session. (CF - ADM). Leave.

Meeting was adjourned (ADM – JP). Leave.
Submitted by: Kelly R. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: Dwayne Roby IDOC Number & Institution: L13943

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Harris presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

Inmate Dwayne Roby was interviewed on June 17, 2014 at Big Muddy Correctional Center. The case was continued from the August call. His max out date is in 2018. Member Harris read the official Statement of Facts. Inmate Roby was very emotional during the interview and was shaking and crying. He did display remorse. The offense occurred in 1977 and the victim was a 66 year old female. Inmate Roby's fingerprints were found at the scene. He confessed and pled guilty.

Motion to enter Executive Session. (VH – DS). Leave.

Motion to return to Open Session. (ADM – DS). Leave.

Member Harris noted the petitioner struck a Correctional Officer in the face in 1987 and was sentenced to an additional four years. He had another incident in 1988 in which he struck a Correctional Officer. He has held several assignments. Tickets were reviewed.

If paroled, Inmate Roby indicated he has family in Indiana but he has not spoken to them since 2006. He could not parole to St. Leonard's due to his sex offender status. He has taken classes and indicated he would like to mentor youth.

Prior votes were discussed. Member Harris noted Inmate Roby's emotional interview and indicated he needs a more solid parole plan.

Samantha Hodapp with the Attorney General's Office stated they are in the process of evaluating Inmate Roby for Sexually Violent Offender status.

Martin Moore, Cook County Assistant State's Attorney, noted Inmate Roby was identified at the scene of the crime and the viciousness of the crime.

Member Harris read her conclusion. She stated she believes to parole Inmate Roby would deprecate the seriousness of the offense and promote disregard for the law.

Motion to deny parole. (VH – CF). Leave.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: Michael Baptist IDOC Number & Institution: C63921

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Findley presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

Baptist C 63921

This is the case of Michael Baptist, convicted at the age of 20 of two murders and one attempt murder. Four men were charged. John Perkins was acquitted in a bench trial. Baptist, Lennox Lawrence and Wayne Lindsay were sentenced to an indeterminate term of 100-200 years for murder and a concurrent sentence of 50-100 years for attempt murder.

I first interviewed Mr. Baptist in 2002, not long after I joined this board. At petitioner's request, I borrowed his copy of the trial transcript. He had hoped that I would conclude that his culpability was sufficiently limited and would recommend his parole. Reading the state's official statement of facts, and the SA's summary-both of which asserted that Baptist ordered Lindsay and Lawrence to shoot the victims, as well as trial testimony that Baptist was present at critical minutes leading up to the murders, I did not recommend parole and it was not until ten years later that Baptist received his first favorable votes.

Based on what I knew in 2002 my vote was correct. Today I know more and will recommend parole.

Each of you have received a copy of a detailed petition prepared by Pro-bono counsel, Sara Garber. Because most of you did not take possession of this petition when we were last together at en banc, I asked staff to bring copies for your review prior to today. I won't attempt to repeat every point made in her submission and that of Ms. Alvarez.

Mr. Baptist is guilty of murder under the theory of accountability. He was present at the moment gunshots were fired and fled the scene with co-defendant Perkins. He could have spoken up and attempted to stop the gunfire, but he only ran away.

Mr. Baptist did not fire a gun that day. Lennox Lawrence-- who still denies to his involvement in the crime, and Wayne Lindsay were the shooters. Evidence adduced at trial and Lindsay's own admission confirms this.

In my 2002 rationale I wrote that I could find no evidence that Baptist ordered Lindsay and Lawrence to shoot the victims. But the statement of facts first signed by SA Bernard Carey in

1976 read, in part," ...Lindsay and Lawrence shot all the victims in the head. This was done at the command of Baptist. That statement was reiterated by SAs over the years, including Richard Devine, until 2006. Ms. Alvarez since removed that prejudicial comment because it proved to be untrue. It was not until 2008, when Mr. Baptist brought suit against Mr. Devine, that an appellate ruling contained Devine's admission that there was no evidence of Baptist commanding the execution of the victims.

Moreover, Mr. Lindsay, in a sworn deposition both recorded and transcribed, has affirmed that Baptist was not an active participant in the murders.

It is easy to assume that Mr. Baptist stood to benefit from the murders. It was his brother Elijah, facing murder charges with inculpatory testimony from the victims, who stood to gain from the deaths. Over objection, the jury was allowed to know the fraternal association and implicit motive.

Mr. Baptist is guilty of murder. The question before the board today is whether or not his involvement should be punished beyond the more than 38 years he has already served.

This year Mr. Baptist's attorney contacted Wayne Lindsay and requested that he submit to a deposition for this board's consideration. You each have a copy. In summary, Lindsay takes complete responsibility for planning and carrying out, along with Mr. Lawrence, the murders and the attempt murder of Mr. Carter. As you have read, he says that petitioner Baptist did not discuss the murders and was not present in the apartment when the men were led at gunpoint down a flight of steps and to their deaths and injuries.

Mr. Baptist's recollection of events leading up to the shooting is not identical to that of Mr. Lindsay, as the SA correctly points out in its letter of protest. Yet if the statements, after so many years, were identical, additional doubts would be raised. And it was clearly adduced at trial on the statement of the only living victim, Mr. Carter, that Baptist was present in the apartment, and was there every minute until gunshots were fired. And it is also in evidence that Mr. Carter, who was shot in the head, did give conflicting statements to investigators- a fact noted by the trial judge.

It is true, as we read Mr. Baptist's written statement to the board this year, that it was not until 2012 that he admits that he and John Perkins did arrive separately to the scene of the crime just before gunshots were fired.

We can never know after 38 years exactly what happened in the 300 block of 60th street on June 13, 1975. Mr. Lawrence testified at trial and denied he was a participant. Mr. Lindsay always accepted responsibility, although like Baptist, he pled guilty and did not testify. Baptist always denied participation. And Mr. Perkins took a bench trial and was acquitted.

Mr. Baptist's appeals were all denied.

For the board today the issue is not to substitute its judgment for the trial and appellate courts. Mr. Baptist is guilty of murder. Our responsibility is to decide if 38 years' incarceration is sufficient punishment for a crime of accountability. As Mr. Baptist writes, he made no effort to stop the gunfire.

He could have remained to assist the wounded Mr. Carter. But he ran away.

The trial court could never know what became of this 19 year old murderer. That question is for the board to consider.

We know of Mr. Baptist's substantial educational achievements, of his plans to enroll in Roosevelt University's post-incarceration program that reports success in employment placement and a recidivism rate of just over 14 percent. And we know that once VAY registration is established he will be accepted into residence and programming at St. Leonard's House.

Hand-written testimonials from DOC inmates speak of Baptist's help and inspiration to them. His beneficial influence is even cited in the introduction of a book written by another offender.

Family members have written of their support upon release.

His institutional adjustment is imperfect. Twice he was disciplined for drug possession. But there is no history of gang involvement in prison, although he was a gang member in earlier years and he was arrested twice for theft prior to the murders.

The State's Attorney has written to strongly object to parole, although I can find no letters of parole objection from any other registered victims or interested parties.

I cannot be convinced of his innocence but I do believe that his efforts at rehabilitation have been successful and that through his writings and statements he is genuinely remorseful.

His parole would certainly not have an adverse effect on institutional adjustment, I believe 38 years' incarceration does not deprecate the seriousness of the offense, and I do not envision that his release would promote disrespect for the law. For those reasons I recommend parole.

Member Blackman-Donovan: How old was Inmate Baptist at the time of the offense? 19 years old.

Cook County Assistant State's Attorney Martin Moore: Read official statement of facts. Member Blackman-Donovan asked if the petitioner gave an order to shoot. There was no evidence of that at trial.

Member Johnson indicated he took the protest in this case at the Cook County State's Attorney's office. He emphasized the words of the sentencing judge. The motive for this murder was to keep witnesses from testifying in another criminal case. That shows a complete disregard for society. All appeals have been upheld. Also, Inmate Baptist has changed his stories over the years. 38 years later, now Lindsey says Baptist knew nothing.

Martin Moore stated the judge found Perkins not guilty. Baptist got the exact same sentence as the shooters under the accountability theory. Victims have not come forward to protest because their family member was murdered. The petitioner has provided variant stories and all appeals have been upheld. A Habeas Corpus petition was also denied.

Attorney for Mr. Baptist thanked the Board for their time in regard to this matter.

Member Blackman-Donovan stated she does not believe he should have received the same sentence as the shooters because he was convicted under accountability. She will support his parole request.

Member Norton stated he has a lot of questions and they cannot retry the case. The petitioner is guilty. The question is if he deserves mercy. He has changed his story and that is bothersome. He is very concerned. No wonder there is no protest from the family members – they are afraid.

Member Findley noted that Cook County witness notification protects victims. There is no evidence that Mr. Baptist planned or ordered the murder.

Motion to grant parole. (CF – EB). Motion carries 8-4. Voting in favor were Members Blackman-Donovan, Bowers, Crigler, Gregg, Findley, Harris, Parrack and Shelton. Members Diaz, Johnson, Norton and Chairman Monreal dissented.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: Oscar Curtis IDOC Number & Institution: C02117

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Shelton presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

Oscar Curtis was interviewed for parole consideration at Danville Correctional Center on December 16, 2014. Discussed were the circumstances leading to Curtis's arrest and conviction, his institutional adjustment and his parole plans.

Inmate Curtis received a 75-90 year sentence for the MURDER of Vivian Shepherd and a 15yr-LIFE sentence for the coincident ATTEMPTED MURDER of Mona Richardson, crimes that took place during the late evening hours of October 14, 1973 on the property of Garfield Park in Chicago. Inmate Curtis had been discharged from parole for MANSLAUGHTER four months prior to these crimes.

A co-offender was also convicted and received the same sentences.

The deceased victim died at the scene from a gunshot injury to the head and lacerations of her neck. The surviving victim suffered severe and nearly circumferential lacerations to her neck. She identified both suspects from photographs, resulting in the offenders' arrests within hours of the attacks. Neck injuries sustained by both victims were inflicted with a broken bottle.

Inmate Curtis denies his (and his co-defendant's) involvement in the infliction of the victims' injuries, stating that the victims inflicted the injuries upon themselves during mutual combat, witnessed by himself and his co-defendant.

Inmate Curtis' last ticket was in January 2014 for intimidation. At the time of the interview, he appeared angry. He files grievances and feels entitled. The State's Attorney is vehemently opposed.

Assistant State's Attorney Moore stated Inmate Curtis threatened the judge at trial. He also threatened an ASA at his sentencing. He is a menace. He has two major tickets since 2011.

Member Shelton further noted he believes Inmate Curtis is still violent. He has no real parole plan.

Member Shelton stated the crimes were vicious and brutal and the inmate's denials suggest a complete lack of remorse. Continued incarceration is necessary to protect the public, and that release at this time would deprecate the seriousness of the crime.

Motion to deny parole. (DS-EG). Motion carries 12-0.

Motion for a three year set. (WN – CF). Motion carries 11-1. Member Crigler dissented.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: Henry Dee

IDOC Number & Institution: C01657

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Diaz presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

Interview: 09Dec2014, 1000hrs, Stateville CC

Present: Mr. Dee and PRB member Diaz

The Sentence: Henry Dee is serving 2 counts of 100-200 years for the Murder and 2 counts of 20-40yrs for the Armed Robbery of Arthur and Edith Snyder.

This crime took place in the early hours of August 17, 1971 in the apartment of Arthur and Edith Snyder.

52 yr. old Arthur Snyder drove a cab for the Yellow Cab Company, had stopped at home prior to turning the cab in at the end of his tour, to see if his wife 45 yr. old Edith needed anything from the store. He was accosted by Henry Dee and his co-offender James Sayles as he arrived at his apartment and armed with a revolver Dee and Sayles forced their way into Arthur Snyder's apartment.

Once inside the apartment with an electrical cord they hogged tied, gagged, and blindfolded Arthur Snyder and placed him on the kitchen floor. The offenders proceeded to take Edith Snyder into the bedroom where they bound, gagged and blindfolded her with strips from her bed sheet.

The offenders then ransacked the apartment. Facts of the case note that the offenders took currency, a coin collection, a Polaroid camera, credit cards, and cab company identification. They returned to the bedroom where they proceeded to rape a still bound and gagged Mrs. Snyder.

They then proceeded to beat a still tied, blindfolded, and gagged Mrs. Snyder to death with a claw hammer by beating her about the face, skull, and body. Suffice to say that the beating was especially brutal. The offenders then returned to the kitchen where they commenced to beat the hogtied, blindfolded, and gagged Arthur Snyder with the same hammer, striking him so hard that the hammer became imbedded in his skull.

In an effort to rid the apartment of evidence, the offenders turned on the gas jets on the oven hoping to blow up the apartment. In a further act to ensure an explosion, they set fire to the

mattress upon which the body of Mrs. Snyder lay. The bodies were discovered by a CFD unit responding to the fire in the Snyder apartment, the time was 0225 hours.

The offenders left the apt. taking Mr. Snyder's cab with them. At approx. 0325hrs both subjects were observed by a CPD unit as they parked the cab in the parking lot of the Washington Park pool. Both subjects attempted to flee but were apprehended, property belonging to the Snyder victims was found on the subjects. The police at this time had no information related to the Snyder murders.

Family identifies the property, witnesses identify the subjects. Goes to trial = Verdict Guilty.

Both subjects were found guilty by jury. They appealed and were denied.

With regard to the facts of the case Henry Dee related that he did not commit the crime, that the police had in essence framed him, and that all of the proceeds evidence related to the Snyder's was not on their person. He claims he was not present at the scene of the crime that he was with his common law wife at the time of the murders, that he never had a gun on his person, that a weapon was never inventoried by the police. He shared that from day one he has been proclaiming his innocence.

It is important to note that his co-offender James Sayles took responsibility for the murders, and the robbery. James Syles was paroled by this board in 2004.

Henry Dee's Institutional Facts:

42 years of incarceration

Has been housed at Stateville his entire incarceration.

This is the 25th time before the board.

Is coming off a 2 year set, has had 3 yr. sets 4 out of five last times before board.

Has worked in the Kitchen for the past 17 years.

Housed in Charlie Unit (low aggression unit).

Last ticket (minor) was in 2009, only two tickets in the last 14 years.

Obtained his GED in 1978.

Health wise: continues to be treated for diabetes

Parole Plan: to live with his mother Ruby Foreman on the Southside of Chicago.

Henry Dee presents well, he exhibits a well-paced and comfortable style of communication.

He's introspective and shared that "we are all here on a practice field before we get to the lord of eternity".

Staff and counselors see him as a model inmate.

There is no doubt that Mr. Dee has established an excellent institutional adjustment.

Spending his entire IDOC time at Stateville and managing to do very well is to be commended. He has maneuvered his stay very well, better than most. And his demeanor appears appropriate and very peaceful.

However, contrasting his continued adherence to innocence, while his co-offender admitted to the facts of the case, looms large for me. It is too bad that this elephant in the room continues to dominate Henry Dee's parole assessment.

Given that this crime was overly brutal in scope, and that it would take a perfect storm of positive forces to consider for parole a perpetrator of these acts, and that it is very difficult to factor in the clash that exists with regard to taking responsibility for the horrific crime, I cannot recommend Mr. Dee for parole.

Member Johnson stated he took the protest for this case at the State's Attorney's office. They are vehemently opposed. There are multiple letters of protest on file.

ASA Moore stated this was originally a death penalty case. Due to the brutality of this crime, they request a five year set.

Motion to deny parole. (SD – CF). Motion carries 11-1. Member Crigler dissented.

Motion for a two year set. (ADM – CF). Motion does NOT carry 6-6. Voting in favor of the motion were Members Blackman-Donovan, Bowers, Gregg, Johnson, Norton and Chairman Monreal. Members Crigler, Diaz, Findley, Harris Parrack and Shelton dissented.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: Dwight Johnson

IDOC Number & Institution: L10298

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Shelton presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

Inmate Dwight Johnson was interviewed for parole consideration at Danville Correctional Center on December 16, 2014. Discussed with inmate Johnson were the circumstances leading to his arrest and conviction, as well as his institutional adjustment and his parole plans.

Inmate Johnson received a 100-200 year sentence for the MURDER of Flo Pitchford, committed during the course of the ARMED ROBBERY of the Williams Grocery Store on the morning of October 18, 1977, in Chicago. Inmate Johnson and another offender forced multiple patrons of the store to lie on the floor - threatening the patrons, the proprietor, and employees at gun point. Ms. Pitchford was one of the patrons.

As the offenders were leaving the store, one of them, later determined to be inmate Johnson, turned and shot Ms. Pitchford in the head as she lay on the floor in compliance to the robbers. The shot was fired at close range.

Inmate Johnson was not arrested until a year later when Chicago Police officers, acting on a tip that Fred and "Ike" Johnson committed the crimes, went to the Cook County Jail to interview Fred. Fred was in custody on an un-related charge. While waiting to conduct that interview the officers observed inmate Johnson who had arrived to visit Fred. Officers made contact with inmate Johnson, noting that his appearance was similar to that of a suspect composite drawing made during the investigation. When inmate Johnson acknowledged that his nickname was "Ike" police took him into custody.

During subsequent questioning inmate Johnson denied involvement – initially. Confronted with the evidence of his fingerprint being recovered from a Nehi pop bottle that had been held by one of the robbers, inmate Johnson ultimately admitted being involved in the robbery but he later reverted to denials.

Inmate Johnson has continued to deny his involvement in the crimes throughout his incarceration, stating as recently as 2012 and 2013 that the fingerprint placing him at the crime scene was his brother's fingerprint, rather than his.

During his most recent interview by a Board member, and having been confronted with his flawed claim of misidentified fingerprint evidence, inmate Johnson admitted being at the scene

and being involved in the robbery. He denied shooting the victim, in apparent conflict with facts adduced at trial, according to the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, and refuses to say more about the event.

The Board notes an above-average institutional adjustment - excellent in the last twelve (12) years - with only four (4) minor discipline reports in that time frame. The parole plan is marginal.

Motion to enter Executive Session. (DS – ADM). Leave.

Motion to return to Open Session. (ADM – CF). Leave.

Cook County ASA Martin: Inmate Johnson never gave an explanation for why he shot the victim.

The Board continues to be troubled by the indifference to human life demonstrated by this senseless, unprovoked shooting. Inmate Johnson cannot or will not address the circumstances of these crimes, leaving the Board to wonder whether there has been rehabilitation rather than mere containment.

Member Shelton stated that he believes to release at Inmate Johnson this time would deprecate the seriousness of the crime and promote disrespect for the law.

Motion to deny parole. (DS – EG). Motion carries 12-0.

Member Shelton stated he believes Inmate Johnson should be interviewed again next year and would not move for an extended set. Other Board Members disagreed. Discussion.

Motion for a two year set. (TJ – ABD). Motion does NOT carry 6-6. Voting in favor of the motion were Members Blackman-Donovan, Bowers, Gregg, Johnson, Norton and Chairman Monreal. Members Crigler, Diaz, Findley, Harris, Parrack and Shelton dissented.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: Eddie Driver

IDOC Number & Institution: C01657

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, and D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Bowers presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

DOC Facility: Western C.C.

Interview Date: December 17, 2014

Present at the Hearing: Inmate Driver and PRB member E. Bowers

Inmate Driver is a 62 year old African/American male who was sentenced to 75-150 years in 1976 for the conviction of Murder. He was also sentenced to 3 years 4 months for Aggravated Battery, Robbery 2 to 6 years, Resist a Police Officer 364 days, and Escape from a penal institution 364 days. His projected max date is June 3, 2045. Inmate Driver is A grade, moderate escape. Inmate Driver has never received a favorable vote. He had three year sets in 2004—2007 and 2011.

Case facts state that on January 22, 1976, Inmate Driver was stopped by Officer David Farnsworth of the Danville Police Department on a traffic stop. Facts state after Officer Farnsworth obtained Inmate Driver's driver license and cuffed Inmate Driver, Inmate Driver grabbed the officer's coat and struggled with the officer. At the same time Inmate Driver's brother, McKinley Driver, struck the officer and beat the officer with the officer's metal flashlight. Inmate Driver admitted to authorities that he began kicking the officer while the officer was down on the ground. Evidence at trial also stated Driver commented, "we must kill him so he can't identify me." Both Driver's continued kicking and beating Officer Farnsworth, which resulted in massive skull fractures and other injuries to his body. Officer Farnsworth died several days later. Just moments prior to being stopped by Officer Farnsworth, Eddie Driver had committed a robbery. Inmate Driver was also convicted of that robbery. When I asked him about the robbery, he denied he committed any robbery.

Inmate Driver denied to this Board member that he took part in any physical involvement in the beating of the officer. Driver said after he was handcuffed, the officer became very rough and violent with him. He said his brother came upon the scene and was the person who began beating the officer. Inmate driver denied any physical contact with the officer. Inmate Driver stated he had been drinking that night. He claimed he passed out after the officer stopped and

cuffed him. Inmate Driver said when he awoke and saw the officer laying on the ground, Driver said he ran. He said he hid out for a few days, and then turned himself in to police.

Inmate Driver is currently assigned to a porter job. He said he switches jobs about every six months. He stated he has been at Western ten and a half years. Prior to that, he was in Lawrence for six months, Menard for five or six years and various other correctional facilities over the past 39 years. He said he attended A.A. while at Menard. He also said he spent some time in Anger Management, while at Western. He said he has not participated in any other training education, or counseling. He stated, he chooses not participate in any education or counseling, since he sees no hope, do to having a sentence of 150 years. He stated his last major ticket was about 1997, and his last minor ticket was in 2006.

If paroled, Inmate Driver stated he would live with his daughter, Shawna Driver, who lives in Danville. However, there was nothing in the file that supported the fact that his daughter would provide housing. He said he would get a job somewhere, but has no job offers. He lacks any documentation or substance relevant to a comprehensive parole plan.

There are numerous protests, to include police officers, the mayor and several victim family members and friends.

Inmate Driver denies any involvement in causing the death of Officer Farnsworth. His account of what took place has varied over the years. He told me he was intoxicated and passed out before the officer was beaten, while in last year's En Banc, it states he claimed the officer struck him with his metal flashlight and knocked him unconscious. Inmate Driver says he is remorseful. However, he takes no responsibility for the crime. He told me if he had he not been intoxicated and passed out, he may have been able to stop his brother from beating the officer. I do not believe Inmate Driver's statement of what occurred, and I believe to parole him would certainly deprecate the seriousness of the crime and show disrespect for the law.

My motion would be to deny parole. (EB – DS). Motion carries 12-0.

Motion for a two year set. (ABD – EB). Motion does NOT carry 6-6. Voting in favor of the motion were Members Blackman-Donovan, Diaz, Gregg, Johnson, Norton and Chairman Monreal. Members Bowers, Crigler, Findley, Harris, Parrack and Shelton dissented.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”

Illinois Prisoner Review Board
EN BANC MINUTE SHEET
OPEN SESSION January 29, 2015

Inmate Name: William Howell

IDOC Number & Institution: C01657

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open En Banc session at 319 E. Madison Street, Springfield, IL, on January 29, 2015, at the 8:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following inmates:

Members present were: Chairman A. Monreal, A. Blackman-Donovan, E. Bowers, E. Crigler, S. Diaz, E. Gregg, C. Findley, V. Harris, T. Johnson, W. Norton, J. Parrack, and D. Shelton
Other(s) present: K. Knappmeyer, Recording Secretary

Summary of discussion for parole consideration: Member Harris presented a summary of the parole interview and a review of all file materials.

Inmate Howell is convicted of Murder. Victim was a 75 year old female. Inmate Howell asked her for beer money and when she refused he beat and stabbed her to death. He also raped her after she was unconscious. He was convicted and sentenced to 35 – 100 years. He has currently served 37 years.

Institutional adjustment can be described as good. His last ticket was in 2000. He has maintained an excellent work history. Inmate Howell is A grade status. His last visit was in June 2013.

Inmate Howell has no solid parole plan.

Inmate Howell stated he has no memory of the crime and was in an alcoholic blackout. He stated there was evidence that was not used that supported his innocence. He stated he pled guilty because he was coerced by the police.

Member Shelton noted the petitioner's codefendant, Joseph Cunningham, admits everything and implicates Inmate Howell as being involved in this crime.

Motion to deny parole, in that to release Inmate Howell would deprecate the seriousness of the offense and promote disrespect for the law. Inmate Howell has no remorse and does not take responsibility. (VH – DS). Motion carries 12-0.

“The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm.”