EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION- November 21, 2024

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on November 21, 2024, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following individuals in custody:

| R61021 | Womack, Robert (Youthful Parole) | |
|--------|------------------------------------|--|
| R47640 | Smolley, Martize (Youthful Parole) | |
| C66348 | King, Roy (Indeterminate) | |
| C77200 | Columbo, Patricia* (Indeterminate) | |

The meeting was called to order by Kenneth Tupy, Board Member.

Roll call was taken by Recording Secretary Amy Sexton.

| <u>MEMBER</u> | PRESENT | ABSENT |
|---------------------|---------|--------|
| Mr. Jared Bohland | X | |
| Mr. Matthew Coates | X | |
| Mr. William Delgado | | X |
| Ms. Julie Globokar | X | |
| Ms. Darryldean Goff | X | |
| Mr. Jeffrey Grubbs | X | |
| Mr. Rodger Heaton | X | |
| Ms. Robin Shoffner | X | |
| Ms. Carmen Terrones | X | |
| Ms. Krystal Tison | X | |
| Mr. Kenneth Tupy | X | |

10 Members Present

1 Member Absent

The Board heard the case of: Robert Womack R61021, Martize Smolley R47640, Roy King C66348, and Patricia Columbo* C77200.

MINUTES FOR APPROVAL for 10-31-2024: HEATON-TUPY

Open Session: TISON-COATES

Meeting was adjourned by: COATES-GRUBBS

Leave.



EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION- November 21, 2024

Individual in Custody's Name: Robert Womack IDOC Number: R61021

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on November 21, 2024, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Robert Womack R61021.

Members present were Mr. Bohland, Mr. Coates, Mr. Delgado, Ms. Globokar, Ms. Goff, Mr. Grubbs, Mr. Heaton, Ms. Terrones, Ms. Tison, Ms. Shoffner, and Mr. Tupy.

Recording Secretary: Amy Sexton

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

The basis for the Board's decision, at this time, is as follows:

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Robert Womack #R61021 was interviewed live via Webex virtual platform from Graham Correctional Center on August 22, 2024, at 9:00 a.m. by Mr. Jared Bohland. Mr. Womack was represented by Attorney Sheree Davis of Sandifer and Associates Attorneys at Law. He appeared in good health, dressed in blue uniform and was polite, well spoken, prepared to answer all my questions without issue. Mr. Womack's holding conviction is from 2006 out of Kankakee County for Attempt Murder/Intent to Kill with a 38-year sentence that was reduced to 24 years and 3 months at 85% in 2021. His current mandatory supervised release date is March 19th, 2027, with a maximum release date of March 19th, 2030. Mr. Womack was 22 days shy of his 17th birthday at the time of the offense. He is currently 34 years old and has served 17 years in Illinois Department of Juvenile Justice and Illinois Department of Corrections, with majority of the custody being served in IDOC.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 25, 2006, at 1:00 a.m., the offenders shot a 26-year-old Matteson man, Michael McCarns, about the chest and wrist with a handgun as a result of a reported confrontation in the back yard of a residence in the 400 block of S. 3rd Avenue in Kankakee. Earlier that day, the victim went to the apartment building because he received a phone call from Ann Hunter saying she had been robbed. When he arrived at the apartment building, 10 to 15 people were there, including the Petitioner and Larry Dudley, who Ann Hunter thought were involved in the robbery. Mr. McCarns asked the Petitioner and Mr. Dudley for Ms. Hunter's money, but both men denied any knowledge of the robbery. All three men then began arguing until Mr. McCarns told the Petitioner and Mr. Dudley that he was going to get a friend. The Petitioner and Mr. Dudley left as well promising to return. When Mr. McCarns returned to the apartment building, he and the Petitioner began arguing again. Mr. McCarns testified that during the course of the argument, the Petitioner's girlfriend called him a "bitch", so he called her a "bitch" in response. At that point, the Petitioner shot the victim five times, four in the stomach and once in the wrist.

Mr. McCarns testified that the Petitioner was close to him and that the gun was chrome. Officer Sais responded to the scene and observed Mr. McCarns in the backyard of the apartment building bleeding from his stomach. He told Officer Sais that the Petitioner and Mr. Dudley shot him five times. Officer McCarty responded to the scene as well and recovered four shell casings and one live round of ammunition near where the victim had been shot. Officer Cote processed the crime scene himself and testified to collecting one spent bullet and four shell casings at the scene. Officer Johnston testified that at 1:10 a.m. he responded to a report of a white, four-door vehicle suspected in a shooting on 3rd Avenue. He located the vehicle matching the description, followed it, and eventually initiated a traffic stop when he had other units nearby. The Petitioner, another male, and a female were removed from the vehicle and taken to the police department. Officer Johnston went to Nicole Williamson's apartment around 3 a.m. that same night after he learned from one of the arrested suspects that the firearms may be in her apartment. He recovered a .25 caliber firearm and a .38 caliber firearm. Both firearms were wrapped in clothing, but the .25 caliber firearm was also in a wooden box. Ms. Williamson testified that Mr. Dudley came into her apartment through the window while she was sleeping, placed a handgun on her bed and then unlocked the door to let Shammyatta Laster into the apartment. Laster tossed Ms. Williamson a handgun and told her to wipe it off. She wrapped each gun in clothing and put them in a kitchen cabinet. When officer Johnston arrived, Ms. Williamson admitted where the firearms were located, and Officer Johnston recovered the firearms from her kitchen cabinet.

Detective Corbett interviewed the Petitioner on October 25, 2006, at 2:30 a.m. The police attempted to record the interview, but the audio equipment malfunctioned and did not record properly. A secondary interview was conducted where the interview was recorded properly. Detective Corbett testified that both interviews were substantially similar, and the jury was played the video of the second interview. The Petitioner stated that he was at the Hunter's apartment building when she claimed that someone had beaten her up and taken her money. Afterward Mr. McCarns approached the Petitioner as well as others at the building asking who took her money. They argued and left with plans to return. The Petitioner left with Mr. Dudley in a car and went to his grandfather's house. At the house, the Petitioner retrieved a silver .25 caliber handgun and a black revolver. The Petitioner stated that the gun was loaded when he took it from his grandfather's house. The Petitioner and Mr. Dudley returned to the apartment building in the car. After the Petitioner returned, Mr. McCarns also returned in his car. He got out of the car pointing and yelling at the Petitioner. The Petitioner walked away but Mr. McCarns followed. The Petitioner then turned around and shot Mr. McCarns. The Petitioner and Mr. Dudley then ran away from the apartment building and gave the guns to Ms. Williamson. Illinois State Police Forensic Scientist, Parise opined that the shell casing and spent bullet all came from the .25 caliber handgun. Ms. Hunter testified that after being attacked and robbed, she called her drug dealer Mr. McCarns who agreed to help her. She stated that she told him that "Larry" and a guy named "Ray-Ray" were involved in the robbery. Ms. Hunter stated that the Petitioner was not involved in the robbery. She testified that Mr. McCarns started to argue with people that were around, and that Ray-Ray pushed her down. After this, Mr. McCarns stated that he was going to come back and "light this block up." Ms. Williams testified to seeing him and the Petitioner arguing. She heard Mr. McCarns repeatedly tell the Petitioner that he would whoop his ass as the Petitioner walked away. She testified that she stopped watching until she heard another confrontation. Mr. McCarns threatened the Petitioner again saying he would whoop his ass, and then stated to the Petitioner "I'll shoot you" as he pulled out a gun. She heard gunshots but didn't know who fired the first shot and saw everyone run except for Mr. McCarns. The Petitioner's mother was with Ms. Williams the night of the crime and testified that she went out to intervene in the confrontation. The Petitioner's mother testified that she told the Petitioner to walk away, which he did, but after Mr.

McCarns followed the Petitioner, she heard gunshots. She then saw him on the ground and returned to Ms. Williams as the Petitioner and Mr. Dudley drove away. The Petitioner's girlfriend testified that Mr. McCarns had a gun the entire time, and that the Petitioner and Mr. Dudley left to get a gun themselves. She was present for the confrontation, and while she didn't see the shooting, she knew that the Petitioner had shot the victim. She fled with the Petitioner and Mr. Dudley and went to Ms. Williamson's apartment to drop off the guns. On October 26th, 2006, the Petitioner was charged by information which was later superseded by an indictment with Attempted 1st Degree Murder, Aggravated Battery with a Firearm, and Aggravated Unlawful Use of a Weapon. A jury trial was conducted before Judge Erickson which began on February 26, 2007, and ended on March 1, 2007, with the jury returning verdicts of guilty of all three counts including Attempt 1st Degree Murder, Agg Battery with a Firearm, and Aggravated UUW. The Petitioner filed a motion for a new trial but was denied. A sentencing hearing was held on April 10th, 2007, and the court sentenced the Petitioner to 38 years. 18 years for Attempted 1st Degree Murder plus 20 years for a firearm enhancement, as well as 3 years ordered to run concurrent for the Aggravated UUW charge. The state moved to merge counts 1 and 2 for the Attempt 1st Degree Murder and the Aggravated Battery with Firearm. The sentence was to be served at 85%. In 2009, the Petitioner appealed, arguing that the State failed to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that he was guilty of Aggravated UUW. The Appellate Court reversed the Petitioner's conviction for Aggravated UUW only and vacated that 3-year concurrent sentence. They found that the state failed to prove that the Petitioner was in possession of the firearm while in a vehicle either before or after the shooting while it was also uncased and immediately accessible. They did however find that the evidence clearly showed that he transported the .25 caliber gun used in the shooting in the vehicle and that it was loaded before the shooting. Mr. Womack filed a Post Conviction petition in 2009 which was denied in 2010. He filed a Petition for Relief from Judgement in 2011 which was dismissed in 2012. He filed a Motion to Reconsider in 2012 which was denied the same year. He filed a 2nd Petitioner for Relief from Judgement which in 2015 was denied by a Circuit Judge and found to be frivolous resulting in a \$75.00 fine and being ticketed at the institution. Mr. Womack filed a Post Conviction in 2016 siting Miller v. Alabama but was initially denied. On Appeal, in 2020 Mr. Womack was granted a resenting hearing under Miller v. Alabama and was ultimately resentenced on August 17th, 2021, to 24 years and 3 months at 85%.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Womack has some prior arrest record pre-dating the holding offense. These offenses were discussed in executive session.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Womack reports to have strong support and relationships with his mother whom he contacts by phone daily as well as with his two brothers who he also has phone contact with. He maintains support from cousins, other family, and friends as well. Mr. Womack has no major medical concerns to consider at this time. He has engaged himself in multiple programs while incarcerated at Hill Correctional Center as well as Graham. He is actively involved in the Advanced ABE coursework as well as the Illinois Veterans Rehabilitation Program which he states is a program to help with communication skills, coping mechanisms, and reactions. Mr. Womack worked as a house machine operator for a month in 2012, as a dietary laborer at Hill CC for 2 years and as a cell house porter for 1 year. He has also worked as a cell

house porter at Graham CC and is on the waitlist for a dietary assignment. Mr. Womack first entered Stateville from IDJJ on April 19th, 2007, with almost immediate transfer to Menard CC a month later. He has been transferred every few years including placement at Stateville, Hill, and now Graham CC. He is currently A Grade and Medium Security status. Mr. Womack has two pages of tickets from 2011 to present with some tickets that are worth walking through due discrepancies in his accounting versus what is on the record in his master file.

In 2013, he had a major ticket for staff assault which he described as being the result of alcohol use and him responding poorly when grabbed by staff without notice. The details of the ticket and subsequent grievance paperwork clarify that he refused to comply with a shakedown, covered himself with a sheet, flushed the toilet while concealed, and pushed an officer who grabbed for a bag of alcohol.

In 2015 Mr. Womack was ticketed for a frivolous lawsuit but during our interview stated he was unaware of why he got a ticket. That same year he got a ticket for Threats and Dangerous Communication which he claimed was for speaking out loud to another individual in custody. Records indicate he was upset about being held back from the chow hall and was overheard telling another inmate that there was enough of them to "seize this shit".

In 2016, Mr. Womack received a major ticket for Drugs which he claims innocence on and states it was due to him shaking someone's hand who was then found with pills. Records indicate he passed another inmate a folded piece of paper that was found to contain 6 yellow pills.

From 2020 to 2022, Mr. Womack had eleven unauthorized movement tickets which he excused as tickets related to tightened procedures and movement during the COVID pandemic. He argued that they were all petty and minor in nature. Records indicated that the reality of his movement violations included being out of his cell without authorization entirely, using phones without permission, being in the laundry room without permission, being in the wrong day room without authorization, taking a shower without authorization, and being out of his cell when the door wasn't keyed open. His most recent movement ticket was on August 6th, 2022, which records indicated he was off of his wing without authorization, refused three direct orders to comply, called the officers "bitches", and refused orders to show is ID.

Lastly, Mr. Womack had a minor ticket on September 9, 2023 that involved inappropriate sexual behavior during a virtual visit. Mr. Womack stated that the ticket was the result of his girlfriend dancing and doing gestures against visit regulations, he described the actions as "twerking", and that officers shut the video down and ticketed him without warning. Later review of the records indicated that the Petitioner was on video with his girlfriend and was giving verbal instructions to her to act out sexual behaviors. The girlfriend in response was acting out sexual gestures with her tongue, mouth, and hands. It should be noted that the master file revealed that the Petitioner has filed a grievance on this ticket and on most of his tickets over the years, all of which are denied with clarification.

STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

In a written statement provided from 2024, Mr. Womack admits to the argument taking place with the victim, that both parties left to get firearms, and returned to the scene. Mr. Womack states that his

mother was trying to intervene, and that Mr. McCarns assaulted his mother in the process. Mr. Womack states that he shot Mr. McCarns in order to stop the assault of his mother. During our interview Mr. Womack stated that he was a kid at the time and felt justified in his actions. He knows now that he should have called the police. He states that the victim was putting hands on his mother, and he felt as though he was protecting her in the moment. He mentioned that he didn't see the value of life at the time. He states he would apologize if he could, and that he wouldn't have done the crime if he had known better.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Womack has several parole options available. His first is to live with his mother, Deseria Burks in Pembroke Township, IL. He could also live with his first cousins or another friend. He plans to get a job, get his own house, and start a non-profit after school program to keep kids off the street. He shared that he has employment opportunities at a meat locker that has a felon employment program, as a caregiver for his mother, at a restaurant where he knows the owner, and as a forklift operator where his friend works. He would ultimately like to start his own landscaping business. He has the support of his family, and his mother supplied a support letter.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

Kankakee County State's Attorney submitted a 2024 opposition letter stressing that the victim was paralyzed as a result of the crime for the rest of his life, and that the victim ultimately died in 2022 although not as a direct result of the crime.

ENBANC HISTORY

This is Mr. Womack's first En Banc.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Heaton questioned page 46, the State's Attorney protest letter from Kankakee County.

Mr. Bohland read the Kankakee County protest letter.

Ms. Goff questioned Mr. Robert Womack's behavior.

The board members went into discussion about Mr. Womack's cognitive behavior counseling.

Ms. Sheree Davis, Mr. Robert Womack's attorney, asked to read the State's Attorney protest letter for herself. Ms. Davis then addressed the cognitive behavior procedures. There is a military veteran's program that specializes in cognitive behavior issues. Part of this program works on rational motive thinking therapy, criminal thinking patterns, and effective communication. Ms. Davis read a letter from the program manager. The finder and facilitator spoke very highly of Mr. Womack. He stated even though

he has bounced around between multiple facilities, he is still a good mentor. He also stated that Mr. Womack was the best in the program, and it would be a miscarriage of justice if he wasn't allowed to use what he has learned. Ms. Davis stated that rehabilitation efforts and grievances were submitted to give the facility clarification of the circumstances due to miscommunication. She stated between 2020 and 2022, his movements were looked at and these places are monitored. Mr. Womack was not hiding in places he was not supposed to be. Mr. Womack is reaching out, filing grievances, and getting an understanding. He is learning the rules of the institution. He has earned a certificate for Master Craftsman, a very robust program. When asked what he had learned, Mr. Womack told her, patience. Patience of placing shingles on a roof. He learned to sit back and study. Ms. Davis stated the program altered something in his psych to be able to complete the work. Ms. Davis read a letter from another individual in custody that wrote on behalf of Mr. Womack. The letter stated that Mr. Womack's work is compassionate, and he has benefited from older mentorship within the prison. She stated that he is doing the work within the prison and now he is asking society to forgive him for his mistakes. Mr. Womack's reintegration plan is to stay with his mother and to find a job. He has had several individuals that are willing to help him when he is released. He has done a lot of work to identify what he needs and fully involved with the process. She stated that he sent her a list of 20 re-entry facilities. She has currently contacted 10 of those re-entry facilities to see if they had any openings. She stated that he has additional employment opportunities between working in a restaurant with his friends, or as a forklift driver. He has a case worker that is going to recommended and help him with transforming re-entry services and direct connections to his needs. This person will also walk him through the application process. She stated that in the opposition letter they stated that he was a constant victim, and, in this case, he was a participant in the situation as well. Mr. Womack has taken full responsibility for his actions and has taken the time to reform. If he could reach out to the victim and apologize, he would. Mr. Womack is 35 years old, not the 16-year-old boy who was lost. He knows he has something to prove and is confident in that.

Mr. Robert Womack read a letter to the board members. He stated that he wants to apologize to the victim. He understands that he is not allowed to contact the victim and will not, but he has extended his apology to the victim's family. He stated that he has contacted multiple re-entry facilities for assistance. He has learned many things and older individuals have taught him since being incarcerated. He has come a long way and is trying to take things into his own hands. He stated he wants to talk with someone to be a better person in general. He also stated that being in the Department of Corrections gives you a different perspective on life and a lot of things out there that he has never been able to experience and see in society. He would love to open up a Youth Center, as he did not have that as a child. He is very sincere and very apologetic. He stated he wasn't able to ask for forgiveness and is sorry for what transpired between them. He knows he prayed upon the victim and hopes the family can see that he has changed. Since being incarcerated, he has reached out to different programs that will assist him in his needs upon re-entry. Mr. Womack stated that he wasn't to be a positive person in society.

Ms. Terrones questioned Mr. Womack's most recent institutional ticket in the video conference room. Stating there is a conflict of the communication in this situation. She stated that he has demonstrated he is a rule follower and asked him to demonstrate what he was thinking that day. She questioned what his coping mechanisms are to handle these situations with the tickets.

Mr. Womack described the incident with his ticket. He stated that when he was on the video visit, you are given a list of rules. He stated that his visitor was getting up and dancing and he asked to see her

hands because she stated she got her nails done. That is why they considered him telling her to do those actions. He stated that he has learned how to talk to people instead of just reacting.

Ms. Terrones questioned Mr. Womack on how he is going to react to situations that draw attention to him following up with the statements he has shared, and what are his coping mechanisms.

Mr. Womack stated he has learned how to react and how to speak to others.

Ms. Globokar acknowledged Mr. Womack's efforts. She stated that he learned how to read and write while in prison. She questioned Mr. Womack on how he would've navigated the crime differently at this time in his life.

Mr. Womack stated that he wishes he would've called the police in the situation and not handled it himself. It would've saved him from the shooting and from coming to prison.

Mr. Tupy questioned if Mr. Womack's Youthful Parole attorney, Ms. Davis, was the attorney for his resentencing hearing.

Ms. Davis stated she was not his attorney at that time.

Mr. Tupy questioned Ms. Davis if she knew of any other information on this En Banc hearing that wasn't presented in the resentencing hearing.

Ms. Davis stated that she did not.

End of discussion.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (BOHLAND-HEATON). Motion prevailed unanimously with a 9-0 vote. Ms. Goff was absent for vote.

After a complete review of Mr. Robert Womack's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to deny parole to Mr. Robert Womack. The Board feels that parole release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Womack would not conform to reasonable conditions of parole and that parole release at this time would deprecate the serious nature of the offenses and promote a lack of respect for the law.

"The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm. The Board further notes that, pursuant to Illinois law, victim statements are confidential and privileged."



EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION - November 21, 2024

Individual in Custody's Name: Martize Smolley IDOC Number: R47640

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on November 21,2024 at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Martize Smolley R47640.

Members present were Mr. Bohland, Mr. Coates, Mr. Delgado, Ms. Globokar, Ms. Goff, Mr. Grubbs, Mr. Heaton, Ms. Terrones, Ms. Tison, Ms. Shoffner, and Mr. Tupy.

Recording Secretary: Amy Sexton

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

The basis for the Board's decision, at this time, is as follows:

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

On September 10, 2024, Mr. Martize Smolley IDOC # R47640 was interviewed at Menard Correctional Center via Webex by Ms. Krystal Tison. Mr. Smolley's interview lasted approximately 90 minutes. He is represented by his attorney, Joslyn R. Sandifer, who was present for the interview.

Mr. Smolley is a 36-year-old male whose date of birth is July 9,1988 and resides at Menard Correctional Center. Official records show he has been in custody since 2004. Mr. Smolley was 15 years old at the time of the offense. During the interview, he was polite, articulate and he communicated clearly.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Mr. Martize Smolley was convicted of two counts of murder and one count of unlawful possession of a firearm in Peoria County case # 04-CF-00613-1. There were two victims, a 15-year-old girl and her mother. On the evening of June 14, 2004, a mother was driving her vehicle with her daughter as a front seat passenger. They stopped at an ATM on their way to get ice cream. At the ATM, Mr. Smolley stuck a loaded gun in the window of the vehicle and demanded the money. He had his hand on the trigger. The driver started to pull away and as she did, the gun was discharged. A single bullet struck the driver in the head, exited, and struck her daughter in the head. Both victims died.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Smolley was 15 years old at the time of his offense. He was sent to a juvenile facility and then transferred to Menard Correctional Center when he was 17 years old. He was originally sentenced to natural life in prison but received a new sentencing hearing, where the trial court sentenced him to a total of 65 years. He appealed the sentence and in 2018, the appellate court noted that 65 years was a de facto life sentence and remanded the case to the trial court. On remand, the circuit court on August 16,

2019, sentenced him to 20 years on each count of murder to run consecutively and to 2 years on the unlawful possession of a firearm to be served at 50% and run concurrent with counts 1 and 2. The transcript of the sentencing hearing is newly made a part of his file. A subsequent appeal resulted in a 2022 Rule 23 Order affirming the sentence. He then filed a pro se petition for leave to appeal which is pending before the Supreme Court of Illinois.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Over the past 17 years, Mr. Smolley has had 13 tickets. 12 were major tickets and he has been in segregation 6 times. None of his tickets were for violent behavior.

His most recent ticket occurred on February 26, 2023, when he was found guilty of contraband, unauthorized property. He explained that his cell mate gave haircuts and an inmate who came to their cell for a haircut left trimmers in their cell.

In 2022, he had a major ticket for impeding or interfering with an investigation and for synthetic cannabinoid. He said that an unknown person sent it through the mail. He doesn't know who sent it and he never had possession of it. When he was questioned about it, he denied any knowledge of the package and they felt he was not telling the truth. He does not have any drug involvement in his record.

He explained that in 2016, he was given a ticket when he stacked things on his bed in order to clean the floor. Boxes stacked on the top bunk impaired the surveillance. He said he immediately took them down when told.

Another time, Mr. Smolley's cellmate had multiple trays and did not comply when the correctional officer told him to throw them away. He explained that they were not his trays and that it would create problems if he threw away things that belonged to his cellmate.

As of November 11, 2023, he was classified as A grade, low aggression level, "moderate" escape risk designation and maximum security.

STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Smolley indicated the shooting occurred as the door frame hit his hand when she started driving away. He acknowledged the gun was loaded and his hand was on the trigger. He expressed his remorse and said that he did not mean for it to happen. At the interview, he explained that he wanted money and thought that if he pointed a gun at someone who was at the ATM machine, they would give him money. As soon as he realized the gun fired a bullet, he ran. In the trial court and throughout his petition, he states that he accepts full accountability, and states that he is sorry. He says he thinks about their family, realizing what he did and of the pain he is responsible for. In the interview, he said he was devastated when he learned of the deaths. He said he took lives, took the family's memories, and does not know what he can do to pay back for what happened. He said it will always be with him. He states that he is no longer the kid he was and has done what he can to rehabilitate himself. He obtained a GED and went through programming while incarcerated in the Peoria County jail. He points to his change in

behavior, changed thinking and the GED and certificates he has obtained. He said he no longer has the impulses he had in his youth. He looks at things differently and wants to show people that even though he committed a crime, he has changed. He gives credit to a cell mate who talked to him and helped him. He told his cellmate he wanted to learn, and the cellmate gave him help with reading, spelling, and cursive. He said he tries to encourage other prisoners by letting them know they can talk with him. He wants to listen and pass on the encouragement and assistance he received. He points to his maturity and sense of direction that he attained since incarcerated. Due to IDOC policy of not allowing individuals who have 20 years or more into college courses, he worries that he will be released without skills to support himself. He wishes he qualified to go into programs that are not offered at Menard CC. He also worries that his support, being his mother and family, will have passed before he is released and that he will be all alone.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Smolley has re-established contact with his family. He has phone contact or letter correspondence with his mother, grandmother, aunt, uncle, and numerous cousins. He also speaks with his girlfriend by phone. He acknowledges needing help to reintegrate into society and states he would like to live in a halfway home. If a bed is not available, he can live with his mother. He states that she is one year sober. He wants to get a driver's license and go to school for a CDL so he can drive trucks. He is exploring 160 Driving Academy with the hope he can get a grant to afford to get his CDL. He also wants to find an apprenticeship with a contractor so he can learn to rehabilitate homes. Another career option is that Mr. Smolley's cousin can get him an interview for a job at Caterpillar.

His petition includes letters from his brother, sister, uncle, and aunt and he has been offered a place to live and financial support.

Mr. Smolley also has a letter from the Job Partnership Director of Education who assists in obtaining employment and overcome his long incarceration as a youth.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

No opposition was received.

ENBANC HISTORY

This is Mr. Smolley's first En Banc.

Open Executive Session: TISON- SHOFFNER Close Executive Session: GOFF- COATES

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Tupy questioned if it was one bullet that took the life of both victims.

Ms. Tison stated yes, one bullet went through the mother and then hit the daughter.

Mrs. Joslyn Sandifer, Mr. Martize Smolley's attorney stated that he was originally charged with First Degree Murder. He was very cooperative with the police and took responsibility for his actions because it was a mistake. She stated there is also video footage that showed Mr. Smolley's testimony is accurate. He admitted that his goal that evening was just to get some money. When he was initially charged, the judge found that Mr. Smolley was responsible for the murders because it happened during another crime. Mrs. Sandifer stated that it was an accident, and he never had any intent for a life to be taken. She stated the judge found that he did not have a grave heart and did not take his age into consideration. He was originally given a sentence of natural life in prison however at resentencing he received 65 years. This sentence was appealed due to it still technically being a life sentence. Mr. Smolley had changed but the judge was bound by the law. Mrs. Sandifer stated that the judge is required to give the minimum sentence and must run consecutively. In 2019, they released the video again and he went to bench trial. At the time of trial, the court found it impossible to prove. She stated that Mr. Smolley admits he had the gun and attempted to take the money. He also admitted his goal that night was to get money. From the beginning, the judge took the time to say that this was a mistake and chose to give him the minimum sentence on each case. Mrs. Sandifer stated that since being in the Department of Corrections, Mr. Smolley has several certificates for completed programs. He has completed a program to become a cook where he is allowed to cook for other individuals. He has mentioned that when he is released, he wants to get his CDL. She stated that his cousin recently sent a letter to Mr. Smolley in support and sent him a review booklet on being able to retain his CDL. Mrs. Sandifer discussed the 4 recent tickets that Mr. Smolley has received. Stating there is no discrepancy between him and IDOC on the ticket for the clippers. They both agree they are not Mr. Smolley's; however, he was still given the ticket due to them being in his cell. Mrs. Sandifer asked for the family who were at the hearing to raise their hand to show their support for him. She stated that everyone is passionate about his release and are ready to assist him. They want to make sure he has everything necessary to be successful. She stated that when she asked Mr. Smolley, he stated that did not have a good childhood. His family loved him and still does. He was shot in the head at 9 years old and carried a gun at 10 years old. He lived in government housing and the night of the crime; Mr. Smolley was only thinking about his immediate needs. He was 15 years old, knew he needed money and that he needed to eat. He thought at that time if he showed the gun and a little aggression, he would just be able to take their money. It was ten dollars. She stated that when you are 15 years old, you think about what's in front of you. He is not that impatient 15-year-old child and takes full responsibility of his actions. He did not have goals at first and believes a halfway house would be best for him. He has a hunger and a thirst for society. He is warm, engaging, and knows he made a mistake. She stated despite the odds, Mr. Smolley has been rehabilitated.

Mr. Martize Smolley read a letter to the Board stating that 20 years ago he was on a path to destruction. He wasn't aware of any concerns and stated that at the time of his arrest, he didn't know what remorse was. He was trapped for so long. He received his GED in 2019 and a certificate from Northeastern University, that was not mentioned previously. He stated that he has continued his education, and he will not stop once he is released. He stated that he is very well equipped and has come a long way. He often thinks about the victims and is no longer ashamed to admit his fault in the crime. His goal is being the best role model and he has accepted responsibility for his past.

Ms. Globokar stated that Mr. Smolley's record has been clear. He has taken advantage of programs in Peoria County jail and Northeastern University. She questioned Mr. Smolley's certificate for a health class and his access to programming. She also questioned how his transition to Menard Correctional Center has been.

Mr. Smolley stated that they had multiple courses. He stated that the discrepancy for him was that his math score wasn't high enough to enroll in some of the classes. Other classes he was placed on a wait list. He stated that he took Anger Management, Art, AIM High, Coping Skills, and Cognitive courses. He stated that he is not always able to get into the classes. Mr. Smolley stated that his transition to Menard CC has been rough, and he is trying not to let people get to him.

Mr. Heaton questioned Mr. Smolley on why he is interested in getting his CDL and being in commercial driving. He also questioned him on why he wants to go to a halfway house.

Mr. Smolley stated that his previous cell mate would talk to him about CDL's, and truck driving, and it piqued his interest. He stated that halfway houses will help him with extra tools as far as learning how to handle his own financial plans and learning how to cope with the world as an adult.

Mr. Bohland stated that part of the response to the 2022 ticket with the synthetic drugs, was the disciplinary transfer. He stated that the synthetic drugs are a big issue in the institutions right now and the transfer was the answer for that.

Mr. Smolley stated that what he was told, if you are given more than 90 days of segregation time, then you are transferred to a different institution.

Ms. Terrones questioned Mr. Smolley on how his family was able to reengage with him.

Mr. Smolley stated they reengaged by 20–30-minute phone calls. He stated the calls where pricey, and that his family would pay for them on their own.

Ms. Globokar noted a lightness of spirit in Mr. Smolley's demeanor in the hearing that would be an asset in coping with challenging situations.

End of discussion.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (TISON-SHOFFNER). Motion prevailed with an 8-2 vote. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Coates, Ms. Goff, Mr. Grubbs, Mr. Heaton, Ms. Shoffner, Ms. Terrones, Ms. Tison, and Mr. Tupy. Mr. Bohland and Ms. Globokar dissented.

After a complete review of Mr. Martize Smolley's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board voted to grant parole to Mr. Martize Smolley.

"The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm. The Board further notes that, pursuant to Illinois law, victim statements are confidential and privileged."

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION - November 21, 2024

Individual in Custody's Name: Roy King IDOC Number: C66348

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on November 21,2024 at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Roy King C66348.

Members present were Mr. Bohland, Mr. Coates, Mr. Delgado, Ms. Globokar, Ms. Goff, Mr. Grubbs, Mr. Heaton, Ms. Terrones, Ms. Tison, Ms. Shoffner, and Mr. Tupy.

Recording Secretary: Amy Sexton

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

The basis for the Board's decision, at this time, is as follows:

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

On September 26, 2024, Mr. Roy King was interviewed by Board Member Jeffrey Grubbs via the WebEx video platform at Hill Correctional Center. The interview began around 9:00 am and ended around 12:10 pm. Mr. King was not represented by legal counsel. Mr. King was 73 years old at the time of the interview and is serving a 50–150-year sentence for a murder which occurred on February 15, 1976, when he was 24 years old. Additionally, he was sentenced to terms of 25–75 years for Armed Robbery, and up to 20 years for Robbery and Burglary, as well as up to 10 years for Theft. All sentences were imposed in Macoupin County and ordered to be served concurrently.

Mr. King would be granted parole by this Board on August 12, 1993, after serving over 17 years of his sentence. On July 31, 2001, Mr. King received a sentence of 7 years for Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse of a victim between the ages of 13-16, which was imposed in Clinton County.

For his interview, Mr. Roy King was dressed in institutional attire and appeared well kept. He was cooperative, polite, and indicated he was in good health. He presented in a manner which indicated he has well above average and more likely, a remarkably prominent level of intelligence.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On February 15, 1976, Mr. King, along with his co-defendants, planned to rob a local business owner, Ms. Joyce Tarro, by forcibly breaking into her residence and waiting for her to return home. During the subsequent Armed Robbery of Ms. Tarro, she was shot multiple times and killed by Mr. Roy

King. It was known that Ms. Tarro would bring the day's proceeds home after closing her local business each evening. Records indicate Mr. King planned and organized the Robbery which resulted in the Murder. Mr. King was sentenced on July 26, 1976, to 50–150 years for Murder and was subsequently paroled seventeen years later on August 13, 1993.

In 1995, Mr. King entered into a sexual relationship with a juvenile female. Mr. King was 44 years of age at the time. The 12-year-old girl and her brother had both worked for Mr. King, who operated a lawncare and mobile washing service. After the brother quit, the sexual advances began, with Mr. King fondling the young girl's breasts. In 1996, the young female's mother suggested to the local church pastor that the now 13-year-old juvenile female move in with Mr. King and his wife, due to the troubled home life of the young girl. The move was agreed upon and the young girl moved into the home of Mr. and Mrs. King. The relationship between Mr. King and the young girl continued and ultimately advanced to sexual intercourse. In May of 1997, the then 14-year-old female victim gave birth to a child. A paternity test was eventually conducted, proving Mr. King was the father of the young victim's child. Mr. King was sentenced on July 31, 2001, to 7 years for Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse of a 13–16-year-old victim. He has been in continuous custody with the Department of Corrections since June 27, 2001. Mr. King's projected discharge date from the Department of Corrections is September 13, 2041.

Mental health and psychological assessments were requested from the Illinois Department of Corrections and these confidential medical records were provided to the Board for review.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. King was sentenced on July 26, 1976, to 50–150 years for Murder and was subsequently paroled seventeen years later on August 13, 1993. Additionally, he was sentenced to terms of 25–75 years for Armed Robbery, and up to 20 years for Robbery and Burglary, as well as up to 10 years for Theft.

On July 31, 2001, Mr. King received a sentence of 7 years for Aggravated Criminal Sexual Abuse of a victim between the ages of 13-16, which was imposed in Clinton County.

Mr. King has been in continuous custody with the Illinois Department of Corrections since June 27, 2001.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. King has been incarcerated at Hill Correctional Center for over 14 years and during this time he has not been issued a job assignment because of his job preference and indeterminate sentence status. There have been very few program certifications completed, but he has had a positive adjustment according to his testimony regarding his commitment to Christianity. He indicates he attends church services on a weekly basis and bible study meetings twice a week.

Regarding his disciplinary history, it has been minor. He has not received an infraction since 2009, until he received a 2021 verbal reprimand for unauthorized movement and disobeying a direct order. A more recent infraction was documented in a January 4, 2024, incident for disobeying a direct order for violating rules by 'yelling on the walk,' resulting in a one (1) month commissary restriction.

Mr. King speaks fondly about visits from his brother and sister. A behalf interview with his siblings was conducted and they presented as kind, supportive and caring individuals. While they were advocates for their brother, they were extremely empathetic regarding the criminal offenses he committed, and the impact it has had on everyone involved.

STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. King admitted to having knowledge of Ms. Tarro by way of codefendant Mary Kay Hughes-Conner, who was aware Ms. Tarro would be in possession of the proceeds of her dance hall business when she arrived home each day. He admitted to planning to rob her, along with Hughes-Conner and another co-defendant, Jerry Baker. He and Baker had been stealing motorcycles and were planning a trip to Daytona Beach, Florida for bike week. Baker did not have a motorcycle, so an armed robbery scheme was hatched to secure money for the trip. He insisted they did not plan to harm Ms. Tarro, indicating they took duct tape to tie her up as proof, but when Ms. Tarro arrived, she was armed with a handgun. As she entered the home and discovered her intruders, she fired her weapon at Hughes-Conner, before turning the weapon on Mr. King. He stated this in when he shot her multiple times, killing her. Mr. King said he accepts full responsibility for his actions and is remorseful for the murder which occurred that day. He, along with Conner-Hughes, received identical sentences and he indicated she was paroled one year before he was granted parole. Mr. King stated Baker's charges were dismissed, in part because he never entered Ms. Tarro's home, and in exchange for his testimony at trial, though this conflicts with information contained in a protest letter asserting Baker received a seven-year sentence. Mr. King said following his 1993 parole release, he was doing well. He owned and operated both a lawn care and mobile washing business and, more importantly, became a Christian. The relationship with his wife did ultimately change in 1995 when they began having marital problems. She was working at nights at a factory and no longer wanted to take care of their twin daughters. This was the most significant reason they hired the minor female, who would become his victim.

Mr. King reiterated assertions from prior interviews alleging he did not know how old the young girl was when he met her, adding he thought she was 19 or 20 years old. Upon further questioning, he did admit after they were engaged in a sexual relationship and he became aware of her actual age, he continued to remain committed to their sexual relationship. He also continued to argue their sexual relationship did not begin until she was 13 years of age and not 12 years of age, as previously reported in published records.

Mr. King stated it is his hope he will once again be released to parole. Further, he hopes his son will want to have a relationship with him and that he too, will turn his life to God. He asserts he has not seen, nor communicated with female victim, nor the son born of his criminal sexual misconduct in years. Mr. King indicated though he regrets the inappropriate sexual relationship, at the same time, to wish it all away would be to wish away his son, whom he loves.

Though Mr. King insisted, if released, he does not intend to have any type of relationship with his once, minor female victim, other than as a co-parent, he would attempt to seek a parental relationship with them. He would however ultimately admit that he would consider re-engaging in a sexual relationship with his once, minor female victim, if she expressed a desire to do so. Though he stated he has no intent to contact his victim directly, he did indicate an intent to have his sister communicate his

desire, given his sister maintains contact with both his victim and their now adult child.

PAROLE PLANS

In discussing the possibility of release, Mr. King indicated he has an interest in collaborating with the Veteran's Administration (VA) in order to assist incarcerated veterans prepared for their reentry. He also indicated he will comply with his sex offender registration and compliance requirements. He requested a release to an appropriate transitional housing or VA facility, given his status as a veteran of the Navy. When released, his current plans are to operate a truck washing service for income.

Mr. King further stated, "I did wrong and when God grants the Parole Board mercy to let this Christian go home, he won't bring shame on them (the Parole Board) again."

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

The Macoupin County State's Attorney has written multiple years in opposition, though none has been received since 2013. Their opposition includes a detailed letter ahead of the 1993 hearing resulting in Mr. King having been granted parole. A short, but scathing 2007 letter of opposition from the State's Attorney, criticized this Board's decision to grant parole and ultimately provide Mr. King an opportunity to sexually molest and impregnate a minor female child.

A current letter of opposition was received in June 2024 from a family member of the victim. It provides a compelling and detailed perspective regarding the impact of the crime and opposes any consideration of parole release.

ENBANC HISTORY

Following Mr. King's revocation of parole for the sexual abuse of his minor female victim, he has never received a vote in favor of granting him a subsequent opportunity for parole. There have been multiple two- and three-year sets ordered by this Board, though those orders for multi-year sets have never been unanimous.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Ms. Globokar questioned if Mr. Roy King has had any contact with the victim.

Mr. Grubbs stated that there is a Violation of No Contact Order on file. He stated that Mr. King indicated he would have his sister and brother contact the victims after his parole. He stated after 3 hours during the institutional interview, Mr. King did admit to sexual contact with the victim.

Nicole Bartell, Assistant Attorney General, requested for a 90 day stay under the Sexually Violent Persons Convictions Act if Mr. Roy King is granted parole.

End of discussion.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (GRUBBS-BOHLAND). Motion prevailed unanimously with a 10-0 vote. Motion for a 5-year set (GRUBBS- SHOFFNER). Motion prevailed unanimously with a 10-0 vote.

After a complete review of Mr. Roy King's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to deny parole to Mr. Roy King. The Board feels that parole release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. King would not conform to reasonable conditions of parole and that parole release at this time would deprecate the serious nature of the offenses and promote a lack of respect for the law.

"The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm. The Board further notes that, pursuant to Illinois law, victim statements are confidential and privileged."

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION- November 21, 2024

Individual in Custody's Name: Patricia Columbo* IDOC Number: C77200

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on November 21, 2024, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Patricia Columbo C77200.

Members present were Mr. Bohland, Mr. Coates, Mr. Delgado, Ms. Globokar, Ms. Goff, Mr. Grubbs, Mr. Heaton, Ms. Terrones, Ms. Tison, Ms. Shoffner, and Mr. Tupy.

Recording Secretary: Amy Sexton

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

The basis for the Board's decision, at this time, is as follows:

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Ms. Patricia Columbo was born June 21,1956 to Frank and Mary Columbo. Ms. Columbo is 68 years of age and currently resides in Logan Correctional Center in Lincoln, Illinois. She has been incarcerated at various IDOC facilities for over 47 years and is serving a term of 200 to 600 years for the May 4, 1976, murders of her mother, father and 13-year-old brother. Ms. Columbo was 19 years of age at the time of her crime.

Ms. Patricia Columbo was interviewed by PRB Member Robin Shoffner on October 25, 2023, at 9:00 am via WebEx at Logan Correctional Center. Ms. Columbo's attorney, Jed Stone, was also present. Ms. Columbo was pleasant, talkative, and seemingly very thoughtful during her interview.

Ms. Columbo described how she met and became involved with Frank DeLuca. She stated that he frequented the restaurant where she worked, and he came there almost every day. He flirted with her and said she was "very taken" by him. After a few months of coming to the restaurant, he offered her a job at the Walgreens. Mr. DeLuca began having sexual intercourse with Ms. Columbo shortly after she started working at Walgreens, when she was 16 to 17 years old. Ms. Columbo stated that she was infatuated with him. She believed everything he said and thought she was in love with him. At the time, she did not know that he was married or that he had children. She also stated that she knew she had to keep the relationship a secret because he was the boss. She did not consider that she had to keep their relationship a secret because she was a minor. When questioned where they would have sex, Ms. Columbo stated mostly in the storage room at the Walgreens or at a hotel. She soon learned that Mr. DeLuca was engaged in a swing lifestyle. He took pleasure in watching her have sex with other men and participating in sex with them as well. She said that Frank would routinely introduce her to other men but that she never received money for having sex with anyone. Ms. Columbo stated that she had a couple of other boyfriends in the past but aside from kissing and touching, she had not had sexual intercourse with anyone prior to the consensual relationship with Mr. DeLuca. She used those word "consensual" which prompted me to inquire whether she had been sexually abused as a child. Ms. Columbo shared that between the ages of 7 and 12 years old, she was sexually abused by her godfather and close family friends, Phil and Ellen Zimmerman. He would routinely give her a ride home from school in his produce truck. He would take a different exit ramp, park the truck, and take her to the back of the truck. She stated that he touched her whole body including her private parts and that she touched his genitals. She could not recall the extent of their sexual intercourse. As she got older, she spoke out against riding with him but said that it was not received well. Her mother told her that he was doing them a big favor. Eventually her family relocated to the Chicago area, and she had no further contact with him. She also stated that having sex in the warehouse at Walgreens with Frank DeLuca felt a lot like being in back of that produce truck. She came to learn that having sex was always about keeping secrets and telling lies. When questioned about the relationship she had with her parents, she stated that growing up, her relationship with her parents was normal, compared to other kids. She had no physical or emotional abuse. She also said that their relationship deteriorated after she became involved with Frank. Ms. Columbo was questioned about her schooling and why she dropped out during her senior year. She stated that school was very easy for her and that she didn't bail because it was too hard. Her only disciplinary infractions were for absenteeism and that was because she was working. She said she dropped out of school because Frank wanted her to be closer to him. He encouraged her to quit high school and offered her a better position that required her to work full time. Ms. Columbo stated that on her May 8, 1974, conviction, she stole another employee's credit card and used it to buy goods. She said she does not know why she did it. She had enough money, and looking back at it she thought it was a cry for help. She was fired from her job at Walgreens because the crime was committed at work, and she found another job. After she dropped out of high school, her parents staged an intervention and eventually put her out of the house. She stated that she stayed with Frank because did not have options and she felt shame. Four to six weeks before the murders occurred, Ms. Columbo told Frank that she was pregnant. She said it was supposed to be a conversation, but he went crazy. Frank knocked Patricia to the ground and dragged her across the floor. He got his gun, pointed it at her and told her she could not have a baby. She said she was confused and torn and that nothing made sense. She was broken and anguishes that her family died because of the hatred she had toward herself. She said that to this day she can't believe that her sweet brother got caught up in this. When asked about her brother being stabbed 97 times, she said she does not remember that. She said that she had gone to a very dark place in her life and fell over a cliff from there. She stated that the thought that she could have done such a thing is the reason she did not attend her prior Parole Board interviews. She also wanted the Board to know that if she knew how much of the murder, she actually took part in, then she would tell this information today. When she learned that Mr. DeLuca died, she said she was finally free of him.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In 1973 at 16 years of age, Patricia Columbo started working at a local Walgreens store, after she was recruited to work there by her manager Frank DeLuca. She soon developed a romantic relationship with Mr. DeLuca, a 34- year man who was married and had five kids. At 17 years old, Ms. Columbo dropped out of high school to work full time at Walgreens and within a year of quitting school, she moved out of her parents' home and into DeLuca's home with his family. Mr. DeLuca separated from his wife in July 1975 and moved into an apartment with Ms. Columbo. One month later in August of 1975, Mr. DeLuca had a confrontation with Ms. Columbo's father, coincidental also named Frank Columbo. Being upset at the relationship to a married man, Mr. Columbo hit DeLuca in the mouth with the butt of a rifle and knocked out several of his teeth. Ms. Columbo grew more distant from her family. In October 1975, Ms. Columbo met Roman Sobezynski and Lanny Mitchell at a lounge, and seeing that Mr. Mitchell had a gun, she asked him if he would kill her parents. Mitchell said he could do it for \$10k. Patricia allegedly said she didn't have the money but would pay for it with sexual favors and they accepted. When interviewed after the murders occurred, the men stated they only wanted to have sex with her and had no intention of killing her parents. Several months later in April 1976, when Mr. DeLuca realized that the men would not kill Patricia's parents, he undertook to do it himself. DeLuca approached Burt Green, his assistant manager at Walgreens and asked him to drive he and Ms. Columbo to her parent's home three times.

On May 4, 1976, Mr. DeLuca and Ms. Columbo entered her parents' home armed with a gun, and Mr. DeLuca killed the three family members with the gun. Three days later May 7, 1976, the bodies of Frank (52) Mary (50) and Michael (13) were discovered. Mr. Columbo was stabbed, shot numerous times, and beaten with a heavy crystal. Investigators found 4 teeth at the top of the stairs and testing would later determine that those teeth belonged to Mr. Columbo. The mother was shot between the eyes and was declared dead before she hit the ground. She also had her throat slashed. The son was shot in the head while standing upright and after he fell to the ground, he was stabbed 97 times with his mother's sewing scissors. Mr. DeLuca and Ms. Columbo staged it to look like home invasion and robbery. They drove family cars from the property so as to delay their ultimate discovery. One week later on May 15, 1976, Patricia Columbo was arrested. She gave an oral and written statement admitting her guilt in soliciting two men to murder her family but denied she knew anything about the actual murders. Frank Columbo was then arrested. On August 8, 1977, Mr. DeLuca was convicted of 3 counts of murder sentenced to 200-300 years' imprisonment. Mr. DeLuca died January 4, 2023. Ms. Columbo was convicted of three counts of solicitation of murder and sentenced to 3 counts of murder and sentenced to 300 years.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

On May 8,1974, Ms. Patricia Columbo was arrested for theft and was sentenced to probation. Three separate charges reduced, and the judge ordered a psychiatric examination on May 22, 1974.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Ms. Columbo is described as excellent. Her last ticket was in 2006 for unauthorized movement, and she was given a verbal reprimand. She is passionate about service in the Mental Health Unit and she is a Volunteer for the Chaplaincy Department. Ms. Columbo has earned a bachelor's degree, Associate degree of Arts, Applied Science degree, and Secretarial Science degree. She is considered low security, low escape risk and is an A grade status at Logan Correctional Center. Ms. Columbo also volunteers for the Literacy Program, Peer Education Training, Board of Health, Red Cross, Jaycees, and serves as a terminal patient aide.

STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

After her conviction, Ms. Columbo confessed to being present at the home when the murders occurred as well as assisting in planning the murders. However, she maintained that she did not kill her parents. Patricia admits that she provided Mitchell, Roman and DeLuca a layout of the house and her family members' daily schedules. She states that her mind has blacked out the details of the shooting. The only thing she remembers is the sound of guns going off. She states that she remembers Frank was angry and was screaming at her because she couldn't get the car out of the garage. Ms. Columbo stated that Roman and Mitchell were unindicted co-conspirators who told the story their way. Her chance meeting with them was set up as a double date with a high school girlfriend. As they were leaving the bar, Mitchell showed the girls his gun and said, "we're going to finish what we started." They had given both of the girls date rape drugs and took them to a hotel to have sex. Afterwards, Roman told her, and ultimately Frank, that her dad has a contract out to kill both she and Frank, and that they needed to get her dad before he got them. Roman and Mitchell offered to kill her father if they were paid \$10k. After Mr. DeLuca realized that they were not going to follow through, he got involved in planning the murder. Ms. Columbo admits that she went along with a plan to kill her father. She said she was sheltered and naïve; in a disassociated state. Ms. Columbo stated that she had anger and hatred at herself because she was such a disappointment and she wished she would have some help. She stated, "I didn't hate my parents. I hated myself." I have always taken responsibility and know that it was all was my fault from beginning to end."

PAROLE PLANS

Ms. Columbo would require a supportive host site that provides supervision upon release for an extended period of time. She has been accepted to stay at the Grace House in Chicago, Illinois. She has identified a long-term host site in Aurora, Illinois. Attorney, Jed Stone represented that Antmound Foundation is willing and able to assist Ms. Columbo with training and job placement matters and may assist with helping find her housing.

Open Executive Session: SHOFFNER-HEATON Close Executive Session: SHOFFNER-GRUBBS

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Jed Stone, Ms. Patricia Columbo's attorney, stated that in regard to re-entry to St. Leonard's, they had just emailed him on November 19, 2024, stating that she would be approved to parole to their facility. Mr. Stone read the letter from St. Leonard's.

Mr. Grubbs questioned if the letter from St. Leonard was filed for supplement review.

Mr. Stone stated that he had just received the letter yesterday and that he was in trial. The document was passed out to the Board Members for their review.

Mr. Grubbs questioned Ms. Shoffner on Ms. Columbo's lack of parole plan.

Ms. Shoffner stated that there is correspondence and a document from Mr. Stone stating Ms. Columbo's parole plan is the Grace House. Ms. Shoffner read a portion of his letter. She stated that there is a 6-month waiting period for the Grace House. She mentioned that St. Leonard's Ministry is a parent of the Grace House. Ms. Shoffner also stated she has reached out to the Grace House, and there haven't been any inquiries about Ms. Columbo.

Mr. Stone delivered a message on behalf of Ms. Columbo. She wanted to thank the Board for releasing another individual in custody. He acknowledged the support of people who came for her today. Mr. Stone discussed the artwork of Ms. Columbo they brought in from the prison. He stated that it is a Maze that she has made to help express her feelings. It is her way of seeing domestic violence and the walls. He stated that people begin their ways in the maze behind the walls, the exits are hard to find, but possible. The other side of the wall is the people who support them. He stated that this is how Ms. Columbo tells her story with artwork. She started at age 7 being abused and it continued until she was 30 years old.

Dr. Carla Fisher, Domestic Violence Expert, discussed her report that was submitted to the Board Members. She stated that she has spent 10 hours with Ms. Columbo speaking about her childhood and history with Mr. Frank Deluca. She stated that Mr. Deluca used a number of coercive tactics to coerce her into their relationship and sex. Dr. Fisher stated that she has changed as a woman. She has a deep impact on others and encourages other women in the facility to do better and make better choices. Ms. Columbo has become the person that other women in the facility can trust and can go to in a sense of a trauma counselor. Dr. Fisher stated that it is very clear that she deserves parole not only for herself, but for others out in the community. She stated that we don't have a wealth of people that can do what Ms. Columbo can do; to be able to talk to others and become what she has become. To help others with trauma and prevent them from coming to prison.

Mr. Stone stated that different religions go to different places to talk about redemption each weekend. It is sewn into the American culture that people can change. He stated that redemption is real and should be honored by the Board. Mr. Stone stated that Patricia Columbo is now 63 years old, and she has changed. He stated that nothing he can say today will make the victims feel better about the crime or

dismiss the value of the people lost, but it's time for Ms. Columbo's redemption.

Mr. Grubbs stated that Ms. Columbo's statements in the past have been vague regarding what she remembers of the crime or the detailed murder plot. He stated that his question circles around the level of accountability, responsibility, and remorse for the crime.

Dr. Fisher stated that Ms. Columbo takes full responsibility of the murders just by being present at the time they occurred. Her expressions over her loss of family are very profound. She believes that the incident never would've happened had it not been for her decisions before her relationship with Mr. Deluca. Dr. Fisher stated that memory is a tricky thing, and traumatic memories can be hard for someone to not be able to remember. She stated that when children are traumatized, you will see the same pattern of memory loss into adulthood.

Ms. Shoffner stated that speaking to Ms. Columbo she knew she was sexually abused between 7-12 years old. She knew it happened, but she couldn't recall all of the details. She explained she was in a dark place and does not remember. Same with the murder, she stated that Patricia does not recall due to the trauma.

Mr. Stone stated that as a lawyer, he has represented Veterans from Vietnam and Iraq that have traumatic memory loss. This is something that is real and is documented and studied by doctors. He stated that the memory loss from Ms. Columbo is very much like that of combat veterans.

Ms. Terrones questioned the personality functionality and risk assessments. She stated that when the 2017 risk assessment was completed, Ms. Columbo was deemed as moderate risk level.

Dr. Fisher stated that she is not a Clinical Psychologist, and she is not qualified to assess those. She stated that a personality assessment wouldn't give any more information than they already know about Ms. Columbo, and she would be shocked for anything but low risk under a risk assessment.

Mr. Stone stated that Logan Correctional Center has Ms. Columbo as low risk and allows her open movement within the institution. He stated that the is also A grade and if the institution thought that she was moderate risk, none of this would be made possible with housing.

Ms. Terrones stated that she believes that risk assessments give them a better idea of how individuals will respond to outside issues.

Ms. Globokar questioned if Ms. Columbo spoke about her part in the planning of the triple homicide. She questioned if she was able to speak of any recollections of the planning with Mr. Deluca.

Dr. Fisher stated that she did not speak to Ms. Columbo in regard to the planning of the crime. She stated that she did not have any memory of the events and she also didn't give any statements to the police from her recollections. Dr. Fisher questioned if her recollection was correct on the police report since she did not have the report with her.

Ms. Shoffner stated that Ms. Columbo did not seek the individuals to kill her parents. She stated

that Ms. Columbo said that she communicated to those individuals that her father was planning on killing Mr. Frank Deluca and that they needed to do something. She stated that Ms. Columbo was a part of the crime as far as giving them information on the house plan, but she did not see herself going.

Mr. Heaton questioned if Ms. Columbo had interest in any financial gain, home, or property from the killing of her parents.

Mr. Stone stated he did not have any information on Ms. Columbo's interests in any of that.

Mr. Raymond Rose, the lead investigator on Ms. Columbo's case, read his letter of opposition to the board that is on file from November 2023. He stated that the horrific things that Ms. Columbo and Mr. Deluca did to their victims are as real to him now as the day he was in that house. He stated that he can still see and smell the house of the crime. He stated how much of an impact that was on their town of this triple homicide. He stated that time has not changed anything for them, and it does not heal all wounds. Time does not change wiping out a whole family. The community of Elk Grove are terrified of Ms. Columbo's release. He stated that he still hears from her family members, jurors, and witnesses of this case and they are terrified of her release. He stated that every time they go through this process it revictimizes everyone. Mr. Rose stated that they intended for her to spend the rest of her life in prison, and to respect the judge and jury that gave Ms. Columbo a sentence equivalent to life.

Mr. Steven Schmidt, a retired Chief of Police, stated that he sent in a letter of protest to the Board. He stated that on Saturday he was at a funeral for a family member and his 8-year-old grandson was not feeling well, so he walked him out into the lobby. He stated that as he was holding his grandson, he thought about the victims. They never got that opportunity to have grandchildren. He stated that other victim was never able to date, to drive, go to prom, or even have children of his own. Mr. Schmidt asked the board to honor the judge's sentence and he also requested for a 3-year set.

Mr. Heaton stated that the Chief Prosecutor now supports the Petitioner in her release.

Mr. Rose stated that he was not aware of that support. He stated that he just met with the State's Attorney's Office, and they adamantly object to the parole of Ms. Columbo.

Ms. Shoffner questioned what the police unit had available for families dealing with situations like Patricia Columbo's who was being victimized by an adult as a 16-year-old child. She stated that the police department did know about the situation due to the victim, who knocked out Mr. Deluca's front teeth out.

Mr. Raymond Rose stated that the police department did not have a department for that. He stated that the police department would've had to be notified before they could do anything.

Mr. Schmidt stated that their police department has social workers that handle those cases, but they would need to be told in order to be able to handle it.

Mr. Heaton questioned the prostitution ring that Ms. Columbo was believed to be involved in while she was in Dwight Correctional Center.

Mr. Rose stated that all of those files have disappeared years ago. He stated that it was on the front page of the Chicago Tribune.

Ms. Globokar questioned if Ms. Shoffner reviewed the master file.

Ms. Shoffner stated that she has reviews with staff and there was no evidence in the master file that she was involved in a prostitution ring.

Mr. Jed Stone stated that there were rumors, and some people believe those rumors. He stated that if there isn't any proof, then there isn't and to just ignore it. There are no facts, they are just rumors. He stated that he has spent 50 years in Criminal Defense and sees too often people going downhill, which is a great reason to grant Ms. Columbo parole.

Ms. Goff questioned if Mr. Deluca was ever investigated as a predator.

Mr. Jed Stone stated no, he wasn't.

Ms. Globokar commented on evidence indicating Ms. Columbo's planning of the triple murders for several months without Mr. Deluca's involvement.

Mr. Stone stated the evidence is clear that Mr. Deluca was manipulative. He had his teeth knocked out for a reason. Mr. Deluca had a reason for revenge.

End of Discussion.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (SHOFFNER-GOFF). Motion failed with an 2-8 vote. Members voting in favor of the motion were Ms. Goff and Ms. Shoffner. Mr. Bohland, Mr. Coates, Ms. Globokar, Mr. Grubbs, Mr. Heaton, Ms. Terrones, Ms. Tison, and Mr. Tupy dissented.

Motion for a 2-year set. (SHOFFNER- GRUBBS). Motion prevailed with a 10-0 vote.

After a complete review of Ms. Patricia Columbo's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to deny parole to Ms. Patricia Columbo. The Board feels that parole release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Ms. Columbo would not conform to reasonable conditions of parole and that parole release at this time would deprecate the serious nature of the offenses and promote a lack of respect for the law.

"The Board makes a specific finding that the release of victim protest letters could subject a person to actual risk of physical harm. The Board further notes that, pursuant to Illinois law, victim statements are confidential and privileged."