

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 26 & 27, 2020

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Pkwy, Springfield, Illinois, on August 26 and 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following offenders:

C15020	ZELMA KING
C81714	RUDY BELL
C83885	ROGER TOLEFREE
C01214	RAYMOND LONG
C71583	THEODORE ROSS
C01355	NAMOR SMITH

C68879 JAMES TAYLOR C68880 AARON HYCHE	
C68880 AARON HYCHE	
C60416 JAMES DUMAS	
C66268 EARL GOOD	
C72940 DONALD WOODRUF	?
C01244 THOMAS FULLER	

The meeting was called to order by Ms. Crigler.

Roll call was taken by Recording Secretary Janet Crane.

MEMBER	PRESENT	ABSENT
Mr. Daniel Brink	X	
Ms. Edith Crigler	X	
Ms. Lisa Daniels	X	
Mr. Donald Wayne Dunn	X	
Mr. Pete Fisher	X	
Ms. Vonetta Harris	X	
Mr. Oreal James	X	
Ms. Virginia Martinez	X	
Mrs. Aurthur Mae Perkins	X	
Mr. Joseph Ruggiero	X	
Mr. Donald Shelton	X	
Mr. Ken Tupy	X	
Ms. Eleanor Kaye Wilson	X	
Chairman Craig Findley		X

14 Members Present

The Recording Secretary presented the July 29 & 30, 2020, Open Session Minutes for approval.

Motion to approve Open Session Minutes from July 29 & 30, 2020. (DWD—LD). Leave.

The Board heard and voted upon the cases of Zelma King, Rudy Bell, Raymond Long, Theodore Ross, and Namor Smith as detailed in the individual case minutes. The case of Roger Tolefree was continued to the next *en banc* meeting of the Board.

Motion to recess overnight. (EC-KT). Leave.

Ms. Crigler called the Board back from recess at 9:00 a.m. on August 27, 2020.

The Board heard and voted upon the cases of James Taylor, Aaron Hyche, James Dumas, Earl Good, Donald Woodruff, and Thomas Fuller as detailed in the individual case minutes.

Meeting was adjourned (EC—EW). Leave.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 26, 2020

Inmate Name: **ZELMA KING** IDOC Number: **C15020**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 26, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Zelma King C15020.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Zelma King C1520 was interviewed on June 23, 2020, via video conference. Also present via video were representatives of Mr. King, Pilar Mendez (Loyola Law School Student) and attorney Ron Hochbaum (Loyola Law School). This interview began at 10:48 am, at which time Mr. King was put under oath. He appeared in usual prison dress and was observed to be well-groomed, polite, cooperative, and responsive. Mr. King brought with him books and religious documents. After his representative, Ms. Mendez, gave an opening statement, she questioned Mr. King as a way to walk him through the following summary of his testimony.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On May 6, 1967, Mr. King, who was 25 years old, had recently moved into a second-floor apartment with his aunt, Bettie Smith, and her children. He brought furniture and a refrigerator with him, and he had placed a sign in front of the building offering the furniture and refrigerator for sale. The victim, Thomas Higgins, came to the apartment in response to the sign and said that he would like to look at the refrigerator. Mrs. Smith, who was in the kitchen at the back of the building, saw Mr. King and Mr. Higgins go to the basement and return, and then heard Mr. Higgins leave through the front door and go downstairs. About five minutes later, she heard Mr. King talking to Viola Kendall, the owner of the building, at the front door of the apartment. Mr. King was explaining to the landlady the difference between his refrigerator and the one that belonged in the apartment. Mrs. Smith testified that she heard Mr. King say, 'Don't,' and then 'Don't point it.' Then she heard two shots and ran out the back door to the nearby home of her sister, who notified the police. Both Mr. Higgins and Mrs. Kendall were found shot through the head, on the landing outside the front door of Mrs. Smith's apartment.

Vasil Lookanoff lived in a garage next door to Mrs. Kendall's building. He was standing in the alley behind that building when he heard two shots. He then saw Mr. King come down the

back stairs and shoot Adelle Young at the back door of her first-floor apartment. Mr. King disappeared immediately following the shootings, and he was living under an alias when he was arrested in Arizona ten months later.

Immediately after the shootings, two police officers responded to a call that a woman had been shot. No one answered the front doorbell, and one officer went around the building and up the back stairs to the second-floor apartment. He walked through to the front of the apartment, and just outside the front door he found two bodies. He went down the front stairs to open the door for his partner and a sergeant who had arrived. The officer then returned to the second-floor apartment and went into the front bedroom, which was next to the doorway where the bodies were found. This was Mr. King's room, and it was there that the officer found an empty box for a recently-purchased gun. The box was apparently in plain sight, but the officer also testified that during his search he 'looked through the drawers to find out who lived in the apartment.' The officer then went back through the apartment and down the rear stairs, where he discovered the third body just inside the back door of the first-floor apartment.

The officer noted and included in his report the identifying marks upon the box, which made it possible to trace the sale of the gun to Mr. King.

Mr. King was initially found guilty by a jury and sentenced to Death. The Illinois Supreme Court affirmed the conviction, but remanded the case for sentencing, as the Death Penalty was found unconstitutional. He was ultimately sentenced to 100–300 years.

MR. KING'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

Mr. King woke in his Chicago apartment located at 4233 S. Washington. He had moved from the South Side. He was staying with his aunt, and he had a sign in the yard, as he wanted to sell some furniture. He indicated that, in the past, he would buy and sell furniture routinely back then. Mr. King was on the second floor when Thomas Higgins came up to the apartment. This was a secure building, and Mr. King didn't know how Mr. Higgins got in and up to the second floor. Mr. King indicated that Mr. Higgins came regarding the furniture. Mr. King saw that Mr. Higgins had a gun in his waistband, and that Mr. Higgins was looking around "peeping in different rooms." Mr. Higgins was Mr. King's fourth customer that day. Mr. Higgins started asking Mr. King if he had receipts for the furniture he was selling. Mr. King indicated he was "not concerned about the gun." Mr. King said he only had a seventh-grade education then, and that he should have been scared, but he wasn't. Mr. Higgins made a sarcastic comment, which Mr. King did not appreciate. Mr. King then opened the door as a way of giving non-verbal communication to Mr. Higgins for him to leave.

A short time after Mr. Higgins left, Mr. King heard a loud "boom-boom," which was someone pounding on the door. Mr. King immediately got his gun out of the bedroom. Mr. King indicated he has told this story "again, again, and again" in the past. He said he shot them both (referring to Mr. Higgins and Mrs. Kendall) in the head once. Mr. King said it was wrong

and he knows it was wrong. He said it was three Murders (now including Ms. Young) in two minutes. He said he ran and was on the run for eleven months. Mr. King said he worked the entire time he was on the run. He went from Illinois to New York City, New York, where he worked on the 39th Floor of Rockefeller Plaza, at the Airliner Restaurant, washing pots and dishes. He lived in the YMCA. From New York, he moved to New Jersey, and then to Washington, D.C. Mr. King said back then he needed a work permit in order to work and had to go to the police department in order to get one. He was a dishwasher and lived on 14th Street in D.C. He then moved to Richmond, Virginia, to work construction, but reported that he was fired because he was a Black Muslim. He built buildings for the phone company and a golf course there. Then he went to Atlanta, Georgia, to work in catering for a bakery. Then he went to Phoenix, Arizona, to work construction, busting up sidewalks. He also worked as a janitor for a company that made air conditioners. That is where he recalls he was when arrested by the FBI and extradited. At that time, Mr. King was using the alias name of Charles Bracey.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. King has had approximately 250 disciplinary reports during his incarceration, including Theft, Sexual Misconduct, Assault, Drugs and Paraphernalia, Insolence, Intimidation or Threats, and other violations. Since May13, 2000, he has had 23 major and 11 minor tickets.

Mr. King indicated he never assaulted anyone, but his disciplinary file showed a number of assaultive incidents. He denied assaulting others, indicating they may have been fights he did not start. He did seem to go on rants when speaking during the interview, without being questioned by his own representative. He used foul language, but would recognize it and apologize.

Mr. King now reports himself to be a devout Muslim. He prays seven times per day and states he is very repentant. He prays daily for repentance and owes God. He said Allah has forgiven him. Mr. King reads the Quran daily and uses his tablet (electronic) to listen to Islam teachings daily.

Mr. King obtained his GED in 1976, while in IDOC custody, and has taken other courses including Spanish. He has worked several job assignments, including Machinist, Furniture, and Maintenance. Mr. King has worked, as recently as 2018 and 2019, in the clothing room.

Mr. King says he talks to young incarcerated individuals. He tries to encourage them to take classes and be productive and not violate rules. He wants to get out and talk to kids about staying out of prison. He wants to get a job, volunteer at his Mosque, and attend A.A. He mentioned two former "cellies" who were released, noting that they are part of the Nation of Islam and they have not reoffended.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. King's parole plan is to live with his brother in Macomb, Illinois. Mr. King's brother is a retired attorney from Western Illinois. He is well respected and figures prominently in Mr. King's parole plan. Mr. King will live with his brother, who will help keep Mr. King on the straight and narrow. Mr. King's brother was honest and forthright about Mr. King's prospects for work, but they intend to keep Mr. King engaged through volunteerism, his Muslim faith, and working around the home he owns on a one-acre lot.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Ms. Wilson asked why Ms. Young was shot. Mr. Fisher indicated that he believed that Ms. Young had said something about Mr. King at work, and he sought her out. There was no weapon found on the victim.

Ms. Crigler asked if there was a pattern of violent crimes prior to this incident. There were none noted.

Mr. King's attorneys, Ms. Mendez and Mr. Hochbaum, spoke on Mr. King's behalf. They agree that Mr. King's disciplinary record at the onset of his incarceration was poor. Mr. King found a better outlet through faith and prayer. He is a proud and outspoken man, who now mentors younger incarcerated individuals. Mr. King takes responsibility and does not seek excuses. It was a heinous crime and while he is never free of its memory, Mr. King strives every day to better himself. He has made time serve him.

Ms. Crigler asked how ill Mr. King is for a 78-year-old. His attorney stated that he has disability accommodations at Dixon, and that he has heart disease. His attorneys argued that Mr. King doesn't pose a threat to the general public, that he will conform to parole conditions, and will not reoffend.

Mr. Brink questioned whether Mr. King could conform to parole conditions, based on the number of major tickets that Mr. King has received.

Mr. King's attorneys stated that his parole plan will provide the stability and security needed for Mr. King to be successful on parole, noting that the volunteer opportunities and structure will provide normalcy and purpose to his life.

Cook County Assistant State's Attorney Arienne Jones spoke on behalf of the People in protest of parole for Mr. King.

Mr. James asked about support for Mr. King in the event that his brother is no longer able, questioning how Mr. King would then support himself. Mr. King's attorneys stated that he has social security benefits and SNAP benefits available; Mr. King would also receive help and support from the Muslim community.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (JR—DS). Motion prevails by a vote of 11–2. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson. Ms. Crigler and Ms. Daniels dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. King's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a 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.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 26, 2020

Inmate Name: **RUDY BELL** IDOC Number: **C81714**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 26, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Rudy Bell C81714.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Rudy Bell C81714 was interviewed at Hill Correctional Center in Galesburg on March 4, 2020. Mr. Bell's date of birth is September 1, 1951. At the time of his parole consideration interview, he was 68 years old.

On May 12, 1978, Mr. Bell was sentenced to 100–200 years for the 1977 Murder of Tyrone Smith. Mr. Bell has been incarcerated over 42 years. His current projected discharge date is August 25, 2071.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On April 2, 1977, the victim, Mr. Smith, had driven to the airport to meet his aunt. His mother, his girlfriend, and her child accompanied him. They arrived back at the victim's residence in the 7900 block of South Union in Chicago at approximately 2:30 a.m. After parking the car in front of his residence, Mr. Smith walked to the trunk of his car. Mr. Smith's mother, aunt, girlfriend (and her child) remained in the car. While standing between his car and house, Mr. Smith shouted to the driver of an approaching vehicle to turn on their headlights. At that point, according to an eyewitness, Mr. Bell, co-offender Orville Miller and two other offenders jumped from the approaching vehicle. Mr. Bell and Mr. Miller were armed with shotguns, and both fired at the victim. The two other offenders were armed with handguns. The victim suffered multiple gunshot wounds from shotgun blasts and two different 9-mm handguns.

Mr. Smith was transported to St. Bernard's Hospital, where he was pronounced dead. The medical examiner's report determined the cause of death to be from multiple gunshot wounds. Numerous shotgun shells were expended. A later comparison of an expended shell recovered from the scene next to the victim's body had the same markings as shells recovered from the basement of Mr. Bell's parents' home.

Eyewitness Audrianna Thomas identified Mr. Bell and Mr. Miller. Mr. Miller was arrested May 7, 1977, and Mr. Bell was arrested July 13, 1977. Ms. Thomas testified in court that Mr. Bell was one of the shooters.

Mr. Bell was a member of the 87th Street Stones, a well-known part of the Moorish Americans, which grew out of the Black P Stones and Blackstone Rangers, and would eventually become known as the El Rukns. Mr. Bell was a high-ranking member and enforcer for the El Rukns.

Also of significant importance was that on September 1, 1977, while Mr. Bell was in custody for the Murder of Mr. Smith, Rowena James, the sister of the only eyewitness, Ms. Thomas, was executed by shotgun blasts. Ms. James was the driver of a car containing her mother, father, and two children. While she was stopped at a traffic signal at 98th and Wentworth, a car occupied by two men pulled along the driver's side and fired two shotgun blasts into Ms. James's vehicle, striking her in the face and neck, thereby killing her.

During the investigation of Ms. James's Murder, a search warrant was executed at the residence of William Doyle and a copy of the homicide file of Mr. Smith was discovered in the bedroom. Mr. Doyle was later convicted of the Murder of Ms. James, and the motive for her killing was to silence the eyewitness to Mr. Smith's Murder. Mr. Doyle apparently mistook Ms. James for her sister, Ms. Thomas, and executed the wrong woman.

MR. BELL'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Bell continues to claim he is innocent of Mr. Smith's Murder. During a previous interview with him in 2016, and the interview in March of this year, Mr. King stated he was at a friend's wife's birthday party in Milwaukee at the time of the Murder. He also stated he was accompanied by his wife and other friends, who traveled separately.

He stated he did not know the eyewitness and had never seen her before in his life. He described the eyewitness as a professional witness in our previous interview. At that time, he also stated that six months after his conviction, Ms. Thomas came to Cook County Jail and told him she was sorry and knew he didn't do it. There is no evidence to substantiate that statement.

Mr. Bell filed a post-trial motion contending that Ms. Thomas falsely testified and had recanted her testimony. While the post-trial motion was pending, and even though she was in protective custody, at least two members of the El Rukns found and confronted Ms. Thomas, despite efforts to conceal her whereabouts.

Ms. Thomas did not appear at the post-trial hearing. However, her daughter, Bonnie Thomas, did testify, with multiple El Rukns members in attendance. Police arrested one gang member at the hearing, after finding a photo of Bonnie Thomas and the out-of-state phone number of Ms. Thomas in his pockets.

At the conclusion of the hearing on Mr. Bell's pos- trial motion, the trial court denied the motion, and Mr. Bell appealed. The Appellate Court affirmed the trial Court's denial. After the post-trial motions, Mr. Bell and Mr. Miller were sentenced to 100–200 years.

Mr. Bell and Mr. Miller then appealed their convictions and sentencing; however, the Appellate Court rejected their arguments and affirmed their convictions and sentences.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Bell has a lengthy criminal history, including four previous arrests for Murder or Attempt Murder, in which cases he was found not guilty or the charges were ultimately dismissed or not prosecuted. In all, Mr. Bell had been arrested 30 times prior to Mr. Smith's Murder, but was seldom convicted. It was mentioned in previous presentations that due to Mr. Bell's street gang affiliation, it may be reasonable to believe that no one wanted to testify against him.

Additional arrests include two arrests for Intimidation, seven arrests for Battery or Aggravated Battery, five arrests for Robbery or Armed Robbery, six arrests for Unlawful Use of a Weapon, and arrests for Attempt Burglary, Criminal Damage to Property, Criminal Trespass, Disorderly Conduct, and Possession of Cannabis.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Bell is currently on A-grade status and classified as a moderate escape risk. He is currently unassigned due to medical reasons. He has received approximately 98 disciplinary tickets during his incarceration. His last disciplinary report was in August of 2016. Overall, Mr. Bell is described as having made a good adjustment to incarceration.

Although he has stated in the past that he gave up the gang life about ten years after he entered IDOC, there is no official denouncement in IDOC records.

Mr. Bell has obtained his GED and certificates in janitorial services and healthcare. He also stated that he was currently waiting on some college courses to open up. Mr. Bell also learned skills in the tailor shop while at Stateville.

Mr. Bell has knee problems, which will require replacement surgery. He said he still has pain in his right forearm from being shot at an early age. He also has lower back issues, glaucoma, cataracts, and takes medication for high blood pressure and cholesterol. Mr. Bell stated he used to run and lift weights, but that he is no longer physically able to continue that routine.

Mr. Bell also reported that he has been a mentor to many other incarcerated individuals over the years.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Bell has been accepted by Roll Call, which offers assistance and programs for exoffenders. Milton Golden, a formerly-incarcerated person who credits Mr. Bell with saving his life while in Cook County Jail, has offered assistance with his organization in hopes of "paying it forward."

There is also an offer of support from Shut Up Ministries and an offer of employment with a property service agency.

There are several options for residency with family, both in-state and out-of-state.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Ms. Harris asked Mr. Fisher to repeat the details of Mr. Bell's parole plan. She also asked about past *en banc* voting. Mr. Bell has not received any votes in favor of parole in the past.

Ms. Wilson asked for a description of what the Roll Call program was in Mr. Bell's parole plan, which was then provided.

Mr. Shelton asked if there were any tickets for gang activity in Mr. Bell's file. Mr. Shelton also asked if there were any letters from the victims. Mr. Fisher reported that Mr. Bell may feel that he has outgrown the gang, but there is no documentation in the file of him renouncing his membership.

Mr. Bell's attorney, Candace Gorman, introduced Mr. Bell's daughter to the Board. Ms. Gorman also shared that she had a petition with 100 names in support of Mr. Bell's return to his community. Ms. Gorman noted that the owner of Roll Call, Mr. Golden, feels that his life was spared by Mr. Bell while incarcerated at Cook County and that Mr. Golden wants to pay it forward by offering Mr. Bell a place to parole to. Ms. Gorman said Mr. Bell's past gang membership is something that will always be there, but that Mr. Bell has long ago given up his gang affiliation. Ms. Gorman also spoke about Mr. Bell's potential employment, if paroled, and the fact that the employer is aware of Mr. Bell's health limitations.

Deacon Anthony Moore also spoke on Mr. Bell's behalf. Mr. Bell's family feels that he has paid his debt and are ready to move on with life. Deacon Moore spoke about the concerns of COVID-19, due to Mr. Bell's health and age. Deacon Moore asked the Board to consider that Mr. Bell has been incarcerated for more than 40 years and asked for their mercy.

Cook County Assistant State's Attorney Arienne Jones spoke on behalf of the People in protest of parole for Mr. Bell. She also noted that Mr. Bell's continuing to maintain his innocence is concerning.

Mr. Ruggiero noted that the only vote in favor of parole was one vote in 2016.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (PF—JR). Motion passes by a vote of 7–6. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Mr. Fisher, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, and Mr. Tupy. Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Harris, Mrs. Perkins, and Ms. Wilson dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Bell's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as parole release at this time would deprecate the serious nature of the offense and promote a lack of respect for the law.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 26, 2020

Inmate Name: RAYMOND LONG IDOC Number: C01214

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 26, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Raymond Long C01214.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Raymond R. Long, Jr., C01214 was interviewed for parole consideration on May 5, 2020, at Graham Correctional Center. Mr. Long, who is 77 years of age, was sentenced to 90–100 years in prison following his conviction for Murder, said crime occurring in Vermilion County in 1963. He has been in continuous custody for 57 years and has a projected parole date of June 19, 2026. There were no other persons in attendance in either support or opposition.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On November 27th, 1962, Mr. Long committed two Murders in the community of Hoopeston. He shot his first victim, 70-year-old Randy Burge, in the back of the head with a shotgun, during the course of a robbery in Mr. Burge's home. Shortly thereafter, Mr. Long also shot Mr. Burge's wife, 69-year-old Ava Burge, who was not initially present, but arrived at the house by chance after the shooting of Mr. Burge. He shot Mrs. Burge a second time with a .22 caliber pistol before leaving with cash and guns from the house. The Burges had nine children at the time of their deaths.

A bench trial was begun regarding the Murder of Mr. Burge; however, Mr. Long changed his initial plea of not guilty to a plea of guilty, in exchange for the prosecution dropping its case against him for the Murder of Mrs. Burge, and the resulting avoidance of the death penalty.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Long's discipline history is unremarkable. He has been the subject of 25 disciplinary referrals between the ages of 20 and 70; this a short list of problems, considering the length of his incarceration.

With regards to his education, Mr. Long has not progressed beyond achieving his G.E.D., but he has earned various trade certificates over the years. He has held numerous jobs while in custody, completing his assignments as directed. This year he stated that he is "not able to do much anymore," and is currently assigned as a porter.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Long has not planned for a parole release, telling the interviewing Board member, "If I die in here, it's alright." His most recent progress report from the institution indicated that he hoped to go to a halfway house if granted parole.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE

The Board took testimony from a member of the victims' family regarding the emotional toll of the crimes on the victims' family and of their resolve to argue for Mr. Long's full service of sentence. The Board also took note of current letters of objection from the Vermilion County State's Attorney, two current Illinois State Representatives, the Hoopeston Chief of Police, and two of the victims' grandchildren.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Ms. Martinez asked about Mr. Long's offsite work. Mr. Shelton related that Mr. Long has had clearance for offsite work for more than 20 years.

Mr. Harris asked about Mr. Long's health. Mr. Shelton said they did not get into a discussion of Mr. Long's health.

Mr. Dunn stated that Mr. Long was cooperative, but would not talk about the crime when Mr. Dunn interviewed Mr. Long in the past.

Ms. Crigler wondered if Mr. Long had become "institutionalized," noting that Mr. Long has stopped campaigning for release, because he has nowhere to go.

A grandson of the victims spoke in protest of parole release. He stated he was 6 years old when the crime occurred, and that it was very traumatic for his family. The grandson said his grandfather was a gunsmith, who was disabled due to an accident, which caused him to walk with a crutch. He further shared that his grandfather did not believe in putting money in the bank, due to living through the Great Depression, and there were \$800 and 4 guns stolen during this crime. The victim's last remaining sibling has just passed away, at 102 years old, and that the rest of the family was attending those services, while the grandson attended the Board hearing to

relay the family's opposition to release. The victims' grandson stated that his father (the victims' son) requested that his children continue to attend the parole hearings after he was gone.

Mr. Shelton noted that Mr. Long knew where the victim kept his money, as Mr. Long had worked for Mr. Burge prior to the Murders.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (DS—PF). Motion prevails by a vote of 13–0.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Long's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Long 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.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 26, 2020

Inmate Name: **THEODORE ROSS** IDOC Number: **C71583**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 26, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Theodore Ross C71583.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Theodore Ross C71583 knew the victim, Margret Abrams. In fact, Mr. Ross thought of Ms. Abrams as a second mother to him. On March 10, 1975, Mr. Ross was in Ms. Abrams's home, drinking coffee and folding laundry, when Mr. Ross picked up a knife and began stabbing Ms. Abrams in the back. She was pleading for him to stop, but he continued to stab her and threw her to the floor, at which point he took a 2x4 piece of wood and began beating her until she stopped struggling. The autopsy reports showed numerous stab wounds about the head, neck, and chest. She also had a broken arm from the 2x4.

After he was done beating Ms. Abrams, Mr. Ross dragged her body to the bathroom, where he put her into the tub and filled it with water. He then cleaned up and began cleaning up Ms. Abrams home. When her son arrived, Mr. Ross left, throwing the knife in a nearby woods.

Mr. Ross admitted killing Ms. Abrams, but could offer no reason for why he began stabbing her. They were not arguing, and she had not done anything to make Mr. Ross mad or provoke him to attack her. Mr. Ross was found competent to stand trial, and a jury found him guilty of Murder. The judge sentenced him to 50–100 years.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Ross has worked as a porter and in the dietary division. His SPIN Assessment has indicated that he has a low risk of recidivism. He has earned his GED and has some college credits. He has a good institutional adjustment, but has a Sexual Misconduct ticket from 2016 and two Contraband tickets from 2018, including unauthorized possession of a needle. He is in

good health, although he has an underlying medical condition. He is not being treated for any mental health issues.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Ross has no parole plans and would like to go to a halfway house, but he has not contacted any organization to see if he meets the criteria to be accepted. He has not had any family contact and has a brother who is in federal prison.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton noted that IDOC and PRB goals are different. He suggested that Mr. Ross receive a psychiatric evaluation before his next parole consideration hearing.

Mr. Tupy indicated his belief that Mr. Long may have gradually become "institutionalized." Mr. Ross says the Sexual Misconduct ticket was a consensual issue with another incarcerated individual. Mr. Tupy felt that Mr. Long's parole site needs to be somewhere that Mr. Ross can receive psychiatric help and monitoring. The victim was a woman who was very important to him, and yet he has no explanation as to why he killed her.

Cook County Assistant State's Attorney Arienne Jones spoke on behalf of the People in protest of parole for Mr. Ross. The State stood on the details enumerated in their formal letter of protest, which had been previously submitted.

- Mr. Shelton felt it was a shame to keep Mr. Ross coming back to parole hearings year after year, if he is sick and needs help.
- Ms. Martinez noted the need for a clear psychiatric report, observing that Mr. Ross needs a parole plan, but that he does not address that need.
- Ms. Daniels inquired whether Mr. Ross had the mental capacity to address his own parole plan, in light of the other observations made by the Board.
- Mr. Fisher stated that the 2016 SPIN Assessment showed some medical conditions, but noted no mental health issues at this time.
- Mr. Tupy noted that there is no letter from Mr. Ross's brother indicating that he would accept or house Mr. Ross, if he were to be paroled.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (KT—PF). Motion prevails by a vote of 12–1. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy and Ms. Wilson. Ms. Martinez dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Ross's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Ross 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.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 26, 2020

Inmate Name: NAMOR SMITH IDOC Number: C01355

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 26, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Namor Smith C01355.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Namor Smith C01355 is currently 72 years of age and was born on January 30, 1948, in Chicago, Illinois. At the time of the offense, he was 20 years of age. On September 12, 1968, at about 9:30 p.m., Smith, his co-defendants, Herva Stephens and Douglas Stephens, and the 21-year-old victim, Sterling Burnett, were at the home of Elaine Goins at 4611 South Langley in Chicago. Ms. Goins and Calvin White were also present. Co-defendant Herva Stephens asked Mr. Burnett if he was a Blackstone Ranger. Mr. Burnett replied that he was not. Herva Stephens then challenged Mr. Burnett by saying, "If you are not a Stone, you're not my brother." Mr. Stephens then hit Mr. Burnett. Mr. Burnett then yelled, "My mouth is bleeding, my mouth is kicked, my mouth is bleeding."

At this point, Herva Stephens ordered Mr. Smith and Douglas Stephens, along with two or three other men who were never identified, to carry Mr. Burnett into the alley behind 4611 South Langley. Ms. Goins remained on the front porch, while Mr. White trailed Mr. Smith and the others who were carrying Mr. Burnett through the house. Mr. White saw Herva Stephens, an unidentified boy, and Mr. Burnett appear behind a garage in the alley. Douglas Stephens and Mr. Smith returned to the area of the back porch. Five or six shots were fired at Mr. Burnett, and all of the attackers, including Mr. Smith, came running through the house and stopped again on the front porch. Herva Stephens waved a gun in the face of Ms. Goins and said, "I don't want to hear no more about this." At that point, Mr. Smith, Herva Stephens, and Douglas Stephens all left.

A short time later, Mr. Burnett was found in the alley, with five bullet holes in his body. Shortly thereafter, an arrest warrant was issued for Mr. Smith, whose whereabouts were unknown at that time.

On October 11, 1968, officers responded to a robbery in progress, whereupon they found Mr. Smith hiding above a false ceiling in the rear of a lounge. The owner of the lounge reported that Mr. Smith came into the lounge, fired one shot from a .22 caliber revolver, and ordered the owner to give him all his money. The gun was recovered. The robbery case was indicted under Case No. 68-3385 and ultimately dismissed.

A jury found Mr. Smith, Douglas Stephens, and Herva Stephens guilty and recommended the Death Penalty for Herva Stephens. Mr. Smith was sentenced to 50–100 years in the penitentiary for Murder. Douglas Stephens was sentenced to 20–30 years in the penitentiary. Herva Stephens was sentenced to 100–200 years in the penitentiary and was paroled in 2001. Each of their convictions was affirmed on direct appeal.

Case No. 68-3913: On October 30, 1968, Mr. Smith, Clifford Beasley, and Willie Boston were incarcerated on Tier E-3 in the Cook County Jail while awaiting trial for various felony charges. A fight started between various incarcerated persons, including Mr. Smith, Mr. Beasley, and Mr. Boston. Specifically, the subject matter of the fight was the rivalry between the Blackstone Rangers and the Disciples. Jail Officer Montgomery, who was assigned inside the tier as a guard, tried to break up the fight. Mr. Smith hit Officer Montgomery with a mop handle across the arm. Mr. Smith used so much force that the mop handle broke. Officer Montgomery was also struck with a mop wringer by Mr. Boston. During this incident, Officer Montgomery was in his official uniform. Fortunately, Officer Montgomery did not sustain any serious injuries.

Case No. 86-CF-86: Mr. Smith was convicted on March 25, 1987, in Randolph County for Armed Violence and sentenced to 8 years in prison, to be served consecutive to his Murder conviction. The Armed Violence conviction resulted from an incident which took place while Mr. Smith was in the Illinois Department of Corrections. Mr. Smith struck the victim, who was a fellow incarcerated person, several times on the head and shoulders with a homemade knife, thereby causing him bodily harm to the victim.

Mr. Smith was granted parole on December 16, 2004, with special conditions: Substance Abuse Program participation, Alcohol Abuse Program, Close Supervision, and Electronic Detention. However, Mr. Smith proved to be a substantial risk and that he could not conform to his parole conditions. He was released to a host site on electronic monitoring and had numerous unauthorized movements, which led to him being kicked out of several host sites. Moreover, Mr. Smith was accused of Criminal Sexual Assault, with the alleged attack having occurred between February 26 or 27 of 2006, at Harry's Sober Living Home, where Mr. Smith had been assigned to live. Mr. Smith allegedly struck the victim, a 29-year-old mentally-challenged man, at the site. However, the victim's mother signed a refusal, indicating that she did not wish to pursue prosecution of the offense, and therefore charges were rejected by Cook County's State's Attorney Office. On March 2, 2006, Smith left his host site and did not return. He was returned to custody in January 2007, and his parole was then revoked. The allegations included violation of a criminal statute, failure to reside at his host site, and failure to comply with electronic monitoring.

MR. SMITH'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Smith states that since his release in 2004, and after being returned back to custody due to violating his parole conditions, he does not expect to be paroled a second time.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

As of June 29, 2020, when Mr. Smith arrived at Pontiac Correctional Facility, he has been placed in protective custody. His last ticket was in August of 2018 for Contraband. He has received over 225 tickets during his incarceration, with a total of 15 staff assaults and 1 assault on a fellow incarcerated person. Mr. Smith has additionally been designated as seriously mentally ill and as a predator, due to which he is to remain single-celled at all times for the safety of others, per the Warden's direction. He is considered low escape risk, medium security, and is on A-grade status. It is not clear that Mr. Smith has participated in any institutional programs or educational courses.

Mr. Smith has consistently refused to be interviewed or actively participate in his parole hearings. He has effectively proven that he cannot follow rules and live productively outside of the confines of incarceration.

PAROLE PLANS

Most of Mr. Smith's family members are deceased, and the last reported visit was in 2013, by a family member. Mr. Smith states that he has infrequent communication with a sister who lives in Indiana, but there is no name or address listed.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Ms. Wilson asked what Mr. Smith's educational level was. The file shows him to have an 8th grade education, with no subsequent GED.

Mr. Brink asked the number of times Mr. Smith had declined to be interviewed. It was noted that he did talk to Ms. Martinez in 2019.

Ms. Martinez noted that there was no indication in the file that Mr. Smith has denounced his gang affiliation. She additionally noted that she had previously urged Mr. Smith to have a parole plan in place at her interview in 2019 and he has not done that.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (VH—DWD). Motion prevails by a vote of 13–0.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Smith's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Smith 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.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 27, 2020

Inmate Name: **JAMES TAYLOR** IDOC Number: **C68879**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for James Taylor C68879.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

James Taylor C68879 was interviewed for parole consideration at Danville Correctional Center. He was present with his attorney. Factors considered include but are not limited to, his testimony, his parole file, his parole plans, and statement of facts, victim's statements and institutional adjustment.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

The facts of the case occurred on March 10, 1976, when a car driven by Aaron Hyche, and in which Mr. Taylor was a passenger, was stopped for speeding by State Trooper Layton Davis. Mr. Hyche took a gun from the glove compartment and put it under the front seat of the vehicle. When Trooper Davis approached the vehicle, it was discovered that Mr. Hyche was wanted on a warrant for failure to report to serve a prison sentence. Mr. Hyche was taken back to the squad car.

At that time, Mr. Taylor took the gun from under the seat and put it in his waistband, under his shirt. When Trooper Davis came back to the car, he asked Mr. Taylor to step out from the vehicle. Trooper Davis began a pat-down of Mr. Taylor, at which point Trooper Davis discovered the gun. Trooper Davis grabbed the gun and started to draw his service revolver.

In the meantime, Mr. Hyche had gotten out of the squad car; he grabbed Trooper Davis from behind, and all three men fell to the ground. Mr. Hyche was grabbing one gun, while Mr. Taylor was holding down the trooper's arm, as Trooper Davis had his service revolver in his hand. While Mr. Taylor was holding down the trooper's arm, Mr. Hyche got control of the other gun and shot Trooper Davis in the side, before then following with a shot in the chest. At that time, a civilian was approaching, and Mr. Hyche fired the gun at the civilian, causing the civilian to drive away.

The two men then drove to the bus station and bought tickets home. When driving around, waiting for the bus, their car got stuck. A young woman, Ms. Feldhake, offered to give them a ride to get their car pulled out of the ditch. The two men took the woman's car, threw her in the back seat, and told her to stay down. They discussed what they should do with her body when they were done with her. The woman managed to flag another police vehicle, indicating that she was in trouble, and a high-speed pursuit ensued, during which Mr. Hyche ran several road blocks, until he ultimately crashed the car. Police apprehended both men.

Mr. Taylor was convicted of the Murder of Trooper Davis and sentenced to 100–200 years and the Kidnapping of Ms. Feldhake, for which he was sentenced to 6–20 years.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Taylor's institutional adjustment is good, with his last ticket occurring in 2008. Risk and needs assessment records indicate that he would be found to be a low risk to recidivate. Mr. Taylor received his GED and has completed 3 years of college courses.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Taylor's parole plans are to live either with his two brothers or his sister, all of whom have offered to let him come live with them.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE

The State's Attorney strongly protests and noted that Trooper Davis has a memorial highway named after him and has an end-of-watch plaque in Effingham Park. The Board also noted a number of civilian letters protesting Mr. Taylor's release, as well as longstanding strong opposition from Trooper Davis's family and the surviving victim, Ms. Feldhake.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mrs. Perkins asked Mr. Taylor's age at the time of the crime.

Ms. Martinez asked about the structure of Mr. Taylor's parole and work plan.

Ms. Crigler asked about his disciplinary tickets; his last three tickets were in 2008.

Mr. Shelton asked about criminal history. Mr. Tupy noted that Mr. Taylor had a prior gun charge, but no conviction. Mr. Shelton noted that witnesses testified that Mr. Taylor held the officer's arm down during the struggle with Mr. Hyche. Mr. Shelton also observed that the weapon had been placed under Mr. Taylor's car seat. Mr. Tupy noted that Mr. Taylor knew that

the officer was searching the vehicle and moved the pistol to his waistband. Mr. Shelton discussed the trooper's search of the car, subsequent to the initial apprehension of Mr. Hyche, noting that Trooper Davis knew at that point that Mr. Hyche had an active warrant.

Mr. Taylor's attorney, Bridget Geraghty, spoke on his behalf. She argued that after 44 years, it is time for Mr. Taylor to be paroled. She spoke of her contact with his family and noted letters from his sister's religious community supporting Mr. Taylor's release. Mr. Taylor could parole to his sister's apartment or to the home of his brother. Ms. Garaghty stated that, while the rally of support around the crime in Effingham County is admirable, the Board works on behalf of the entire State, not just Effingham. She stated there is no value to continuing to keep Mr. Taylor in prison and emphasized that there should be an opportunity for redemption and mercy for those who have served their sentence and been rehabilitated by it. Ms. Geraghty also spoke of Mr. Taylor's longstanding acceptance of responsibility and remorse for his actions.

Mr. Shelton noted that Mr. Taylor was offered a deal of 20 years for testifying against Mr. Hyche and did not take the deal.

Protest letters were read by a member of the Davis family. She noted that even though the crime occurred in 1976, her family is still affected to this day.

Effingham County State's Attorney Bryan Kibler also spoke in protest of parole on behalf of the People. He spoke of the brotherhood of officers and the feelings that parole would evoke. SA Kibler argued that allowing cop killers to be paroled would be an insult to the officers and noted that several officers had been shot or killed recently. SA Kibler further stated that Mr. Taylor, despite being 70 years of age, would still be able to commit crimes. SA Kibler spoke on behalf of the Kidnapping victim, Ms. Feldhake, noting that she saw men with car issues and attempted to help. SA Kibler asked the Board to deny parole.

Mr. Brink noted other letters of protest received by the Board.

Ms. Martinez asked SA Kibler about the four recent officer deaths. SA Kibler said those cases are not resolved, but explained that they comprised a combination of deaths due to a shooting and vehicular accidents. SA Kibler noted that, under the current statute, the sentence for Murder of a Peace Officer is Natural Life, to be served at 100%.

Mr. Shelton noted that Mr. Taylor has stated that he was just along for the ride, but that witnesses have stated that Mr. Taylor held the officer's arm down, and that he was the one who pushed the Kidnapping victim down in the car, telling her that she wouldn't be hurt if she did as she was told.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (KT—DS). Motion fails by a vote of 5–8. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Mr. Fisher, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, and Mr. Tupy. Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins and Ms. Wilson dissented. Procedural motion to invert the vote granted by acclamation. Parole is therefore granted as a matter of State law, due to having received a vote in favor of granting parole release from a majority of the appointed Members of the Board.

After a complete review of Mr. Taylor's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Taylor, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Taylor is an appropriate candidate for parole release at this time.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 27, 2020

Inmate Name: AARON HYCHE IDOC Number: C68880

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Aaron Hyche C68880.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

On July 16, 2020, Aaron Hyche C68880 was interviewed via video conference at Dixon Correctional Center. Present for the interview were his attorney, Carolyn Klarquist, and law students Molly Crane and Jennifer Shanahan, from Northwestern School of Law. All three were representing Mr. Hyche *pro bono* on behalf of the John Howard Association. Mr. Hyche was very cooperative and engaged throughout the interview. He reports that he suffers from Parkinson's Disease, is confined to a wheelchair, and speech was shaky. Prisoner Review Board Member Daniel Brink was also present.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On January 27, 1976, Mr. Hyche pled guilty to Attempt Murder and Armed Robbery and was sentenced to 4–8 years. He was given a 5-day stay of incarceration, after which he was expected to appear and begin his sentence. Mr. Hyche violated his bond and became a fugitive.

On March 18, 1976, Trooper Layton Davis stopped an automobile driven by Mr. Hyche for speeding on Interstate 57 in Effingham County. Mr. Hyche was driving on his way to Texas, along with his passenger James Taylor. Trooper Davis had been informed by State authorities that an arrest warrant for Mr. Hyche was outstanding. Trooper Davis searched Mr. Hyche, before then searching the passenger, Mr. Taylor, who had Mr. Hyche's gun. A struggle ensued between Mr. Taylor and Trooper Davis outside the car.

A passing male motorist witnessed the altercation. The motorist stopped his vehicle and went to help Trooper Davis. Before the motorist could render any aid, Mr. Hyche picked up the gun, which was on the ground, and shot Trooper Davis three times. Trooper Davis died from these wounds. At least two shots were fired at the motorist through his windshield, as he

hurriedly returned to his vehicle and sped away. The motorist left the highway at the first available exit and notified the Illinois State Police of the incident by telephone.

Shortly after Trooper Davis's death, a female motorist saw Mr. Hyche and his companion near a car in a ditch off a county road. This motorist stopped to offer them her assistance. The men forced her into the back of her car and drove off. Following a high-speed chase and an attempt to avoid being roadblocked, the car spun off the road and both Mr. Hyche and Mr. Taylor attempted to run from the scene. Mr. Hyche and Mr. Taylor were subsequently arrested and charged with the offenses of Murder, Attempt Murder, and Kidnapping.

Mr. James Taylor was convicted of all three of the same offenses and was sentence to 100-200 years. His current MSR is April 27, 2066. He is coming off a one-year set and his case will be presented in August 2020.

MR. HYCHE'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

Mr. Hyche was able to answer questions regarding the incidents, but was unable to put the whole story together. He quickly answered the questions with what appeared to be his first thought and was not concerned about how the answered sounded.

Mr. Hyche stated that when he was pulled over, he gave his driver's license to Trooper Davis, realizing he was going to jail due to the outstanding warrant. Mr. Hyche stated he cooperated and was placed in the front seat of Trooper Davis's car. He watched as Mr. Taylor started to resist Trooper Davis. Mr. Hyche stated, "I knew [Mr. Taylor] didn't have no [sic] ID and he put my gun in his pants." Mr. Hyche further stated that he saw Mr. Taylor pick up Mr. Hyche's gun. Mr. Hyche stated that Trooper Davis and Mr. Taylor began to wrestle and rolled into the ditch, out of Mr. Hyche's sight. He said he got out of the squad car and went down into the ditch, where Trooper Davis and Mr. Taylor were fighting over the gun, as Trooper Davis was trying to shoot Mr. Taylor.

Mr. Hyche stated he then picked up the gun, which was between their legs, and shot Trooper Davis once. Mr. Hyche then shot Trooper Davis again as he turned and looked at Mr. Hyche. Mr. Hyche stated he was unaware of how many more times he shot Trooper Davis until last year during the interview, when Mr. Hyche was told he had fired twice more. Mr. Hyche stated the motorist was standing next to him when he shot Trooper Davis, but that the motorist started to run after the shots were fired. Mr. Hyche stated he then fired once at the motorist. Mr. Hyche stated they left the scene and were on a county road, when the girl stopped to help. He stated that neither he nor Mr. Taylor threatened or touched the girl. Mr. Hyche stated there was no need to hurt her, as she was trying to help them. Mr. Hyche stated the girl could have suffered injuries during the high-speed chase, as they were going over 100 miles per hour at times.

Mr. Hyche stated he shot Trooper Davis in order to save Mr. Taylor from being shot. Mr. Hyche stated that when he saw Mr. Taylor and Trooper Davis wrestling, he became scared for

both of their lives. Mr. Hyche stated that if he didn't shoot Trooper Davis, Mr. Taylor would probably be dead.

Mr. Hyche stated he is very remorseful for what he did in taking Trooper Davis's life. Mr. Hyche stated that, in the past few years, he has taken some classes which help him realize what he did, and that he wasn't living his life "right." He stated his aunt and cousin had been killed in the past and realized the pain it has caused him and his family. Mr. Hyche stated he started thinking about the pain this has caused Trooper Davis and his family. Mr. Hyche has written apology letters to the family and provided them to his attorney, which are included in his petition for parole release.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Hyche's criminal record prior to his arrest for Murder in 1976 includes a 1966 Armed Robbery, for which he was sentenced to 18 months of incarceration; two Armed Robbery convictions in 1970, for which he was sentenced to 2–3 years; an Armed Robbery in 1971, for which he received a sentence of 2–3 years; an Armed Robbery in 1973, for which he was sentenced to 4–8 years; and a 1976 Armed Robbery and Attempt Murder, for which he was sentenced to 4–8 years.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Hyche's adjustment is mixed, as he has received numerous tickets throughout his incarceration. He has received 44 minor tickets and 39 major tickets since 1999. In the last three years, he has received one ticket in 2020, two in 2019, and three in 2018. His last violent ticket was in 2014, when he tried to push a member of IDOC staff. Mr. Hyche reported that he receives tickets because of the nature of his instant offenses. He also stated his chronic pain does affect his attitude at times. He stated that, before his medical condition deteriorated, he would argue with staff and now he "just kinda give up."

Mr. Hyche received his Associate's Degree in 1985, a Bachelor's Degree in 1996, and a Paralegal Certificate in 1996. He has worked several assignments in the past, which included housing unit janitor and employee commissary worker. He is currently unassigned and resides in the Dixon medical unit. Mr. Hyche reported he is a practicing Buddhist and has used his faith to help others, mostly by resolving conflicts and mentoring other inmates.

Mr. Hyche's health status is reported to be stable at this time. Mr. Hyche's medical condition is well documented, as he suffers from tremors, which are consistent with his Parkinson's Disease, which he stated was diagnosed in 2010 or 2011. His current and past medical issues include prostate cancer, glaucoma, vertigo, hypothyroidism, hypertension, a brain lesion, dysphagia, gingivitis, and tooth loss.

Mr. Hyche stated his current health conditions make it very difficult to care for his daily needs. He stated he has been assigned two medical assistants to help him, with one assisting in the morning and the other at night. He stated he needs to use a wheelchair, but can walk short distances with assistance for purposes such as using the bathroom. He stated the "[Parkinson's] Disease has gotten me down, I'm hurting all the time, my body hurts, my teeth are falling out and I can't walk." In addition to his inability to walk, he has difficulty swallowing, chewing, speaking, drooling, and has memory loss. Mr. Hyche reported he also suffers from difficulty controlling his bladder. Mr. Hyche stated his medical condition is getting "worse" every year.

When asked what he feels his life expectancy is, he stated "Well, Mahammad Ali lived to be in his 80's." Mr. Hyche stated he believes he is getting poor care. He was also asked how he would get better care if released, and he stated he thought he could receive better medication. He stated, "They don't tell me anything."

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Hyche stated that, if granted parole, he would request to live with his brother in the Chicago area. Mr. Hyche stated that his younger brother is aware of Mr. Hyche's medical needs and would assist him as necessary. He stated his brother currently helps care for their mother, who also suffers from Parkinson's Disease.

In addition, Mr. Hyche has been accepted with the National Alliance for the Empowerment of the Formerly Incarcerated, which would provide virtual services due to COVID-19. These services include cognitive behavioral therapy, re-entry counseling, one-on-one mentoring, and life skills training. This parole plan has been discussed with Mr. Hyche's brother by telephone, and he confirmed the details of the plan. Mr. Hyche's brother stated that he is ready and willing to do whatever is needed to help his brother. Mr. Hyche's brother also stated that all of Mr. Hyche's other family members are committed to helping him, if he is granted parole.

Mr. Hyche has also been accepted by the Bridge to Freedom program and the IMAN house, however the IMAN house had not yet been confirmed at the time of the interview, as this is his third option. He also has been accepted as a Legal Content Volunteer with Illinois Aid Online. This position would allow him to use his paralegal certification to help others who are incarcerated. Mr. Hyche would also like to pursue a Master's Degree.

Additionally, Mr. Hyche's legal representatives included numerous documents arguing that Mr. Hyche should be considered for release due to the coronavirus pandemic. They indicated that Mr. Hyche's medical condition causes him to be considered high risk. Included with Mr. Hyche's petition is an Affidavit from Dr. William Weber, who reviewed Mr. Hyche's medical record and explained why he would be considered high risk within a correctional setting.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE

Protest letters have been received from numerous family members of Trooper Davis, as well as members of the local community and law enforcement. As in the past, opposition letters have been received from the Effingham County State's Attorney, and their Office continues to strongly oppose any grant of parole release to Mr. Hyche.

EN BANC HISTORY

Mr. Hyche was last considered for parole release in 2019, at which hearing he received two votes in favor of release, from Ms. Crigler and Ms. Daniels. Prior to that, he had not received any votes in favor of parole being granted. Mr. Hyche was first eligible for parole in 1984; this will be his 20th parole consideration hearing before the Board.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton noted that Mr. Hyche was 25 at the time of the crime and listed the crimes he had committed prior to this one. Mr. Shelton addressed the comment made earlier by the attorney for Mr. Hyche's co-offender, Mr. Taylor, noting that she had stated there was "no value" to keeping Mr. Taylor incarcerated. Mr. Shelton noted that he felt that sentiment to be offensive to everyday citizens who follow the law.

Mr. Ruggiero discussed Mr. Hyche's past disciplinary reports. Mr. Ruggiero observed that if correctional officers could not control a 65-year-old man, there is no way his family could expect to control him on parole.

Ms. Martinez said the report of the last ticket for fighting noted an antisocial personality and asked if there were any new reports.

Mr. Hyche's attorney, Molly Crane, spoke on his behalf. She stated that last ticket stemmed from an incident in which her client was defending himself against another incarcerated person. Ms. Crane spoke regarding Mr. Hyche's extensive medical conditions. Ms. Crane stated that he has a strong parole plan, is remorseful for his actions, and is extremely ill.

Ms. Harris asked about the ability of Mr. Hyche's brother to care for him. She noted that care is expensive and exhausting on the care giver, especially an elderly caregiver. Ms. Crane said that Mr. Hyche's brother owns his home, which is wheelchair-accessible, and has taken care of their mother, who also has Parkinson's Disease.

Mr. Hyche's brother spoke to the Board about his willingness and ability to care for his brother, should he be paroled. Mr. Hyche was also noted as possibly being able to receive government-issued subsidies to help with expenses.

Ms. Crigler asked about Parkinson's Disease affecting the mind. It was noted that memory loss is listed in Mr. Hyche's record, but no distortions of memory were noted.

A member of Trooper Davis's family read a letter of protest from one of his sons, who lives out-of-state, imploring the Board to deny parole release to Mr. Hyche.

Effingham County State's Attorney Bryan Kibler also spoke in protest of parole on behalf of the People. He indicated that he also specifically spoke on behalf of the Kidnapping victim in this case and requested that the Board deny parole.

Ms. Crane noted that Mr. Hyche has accepted responsibility and argued that he has been rehabilitated, stating that in this instance, IDOC has done its job.

Mrs. Perkins noted that Mr. Hyche has earned both an Associate's Degree and a Bachelor's Degree during his incarceration.

Subsequent to the denial of parole, a motion was made for a 3-year set, which was then amended to a 2-year set, by Mr. Tupy, seconded by Mr. Ruggiero. Mr. Tupy stated that Mr. Hyche killed a trooper in the line of duty, noting that he and his codefendant were pulled over while he had an active warrant. Mr. Tupy noted that Mr. Hyche planned to run to Texas and hide, and ultimately gunned down the trooper in the process.

Ms. Daniels asked Mr. Tupy why he felt Mr. Hyche deserved a 2-year set. Mr. Tupy indicated that he felt that Mr. Hyche has continued to get disciplinary tickets and is not ready to parole in the near future.

Mr. Ruggiero noted that he seconded the set motion, as he felt it to be unfair to the victims and the victims' families to come back each year and relive their heartache.

Mr. Shelton noted that although he supports both a denial of parole release and a multiyear set before the next parole consideration hearing, he would likely support an emergency clemency request, in the event that Mr. Hyche were to become so ill that death is inevitable and imminent, so that Mr. Hyche could pass away at home with his family.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (DB—KT). Motion prevails by a vote of 11–2. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, and Mr. Tupy. Ms. Crigler and Ms. Daniels dissented.

Motion for a 2-year set (KT—JR). Motion fails by a vote of 6–7. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Fisher, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson. Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, and Ms. Martinez dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Hyche's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Hyche 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.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 27, 2020

Inmate Name: **JAMES DUMAS** IDOC Number: **C60416**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for James Dumas C60416.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

STATEMENT OF FACTS

While on parole for a criminal offense in the state of Indiana, James Dumas C60416 traveled to Illinois, and, with the assistance of an unidentified accomplice, committed an Armed Robbery of a Shell gas station in Danville, Illinois. During the Armed Robbery, Mr. Dumas shot and killed the gas station attendant, who was a 15-year-old honor student on the verge of receiving his Eagle Scout award. Mr. Dumas and his accomplice collected about \$25.00 from the Armed Robbery. The record indicates that Mr. Dumas and his accomplice already had the money and were on their way out of the gas station, when Mr. Dumas shot and killed 15-year-old David Grindstaff. Mr. Dumas's accomplice was never identified, nor has he been brought to justice. Mr. Dumas was 31 years old at the time of the offense; he is now 77 years old.

MR. DUMAS'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

During the initial meeting with Mr. Dumas for his parole consideration interview, he claimed he did not know his accomplice, indicating that they had met at a baseball game. He said that he used heroin, was addicted at the time of the crime, and "was out of control." Mr. Dumas said he was never in a gang and took a six-month Humanities course that helped him to overcome his drug addiction.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

In addition to his sentences from the instant case, for Murder and Armed Robbery, Mr. Dumas has additional convictions for Resisting a Peace Officer, Theft, and Possession of a Firearm, for which he was sentenced to 3 years. All of Mr. Dumas's convictions were noted to run concurrently.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Dumas has had a good institutional adjustment. He has received four minor disciplinary tickets. From 1985–1999, he went without receiving a single inmate disciplinary report. He has not received a disciplinary report since 2009.

Mr. Dumas is the official seamstress for the prison. He also has a letter from the mother of an incarcerated individual who served time with Mr. Dumas, and who writes that Mr. Dumas was her son's cellmate; she relates that Mr. Dumas helped her son follow the rules and "stay out of trouble." She writes that her son, who has since been released, continues to write to Mr. Dumas.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Dumas plans to live with his cousin and to get a job as a tailor in a local cleaner or some other business that requires sewing skills. He eventually plans to open his own tailoring shop. Mr. Dumas has also been accepted at St. Leonard's House.

Additionally, in his second interview, Mr. Dumas was much more animated and willing to engage in the discussion. During this subsequent interview, he opened up about his relationship with his daughter, stating that he was incarcerated when she was 7 years old; she is now 53 years old and he observed that they never had an opportunity to establish a father/daughter relationship. Mr. Dumas indicated that hopes to establish an appropriate relationship with her once he is released.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Dumas's attorneys, Melinda Power and Susan Ritacca, spoke on his behalf. They realize that what Mr. Dumas has done cannot be undone. Mr. Dumas loves to read and do tailoring. He represents no threat to anyone. Ms. Power noted that 45 years is a very long time.

Mr. Dumas's cousin was introduced to the Board and also spoke on Mr. Dumas's behalf. His cousin said she has written to Mr. Dumas since 1987 and continues to support him. She also noted that her husband supports her desire to help Mr. Dumas's return to society.

Mr. Dumas's former supervisor at Shawnee Correctional Center, who is now retired, also spoke in support of him. She stated he showed nothing but respect and was very protective of her. She said Mr. Dumas has accepted the Lord as his Savior and is a changed man.

Mrs. Perkins asked the attorneys if they had a letter of acceptance from St. Leonard's House; Mr. Dumas's attorneys indicated they do not yet have a confirmation letter, but that they

have been in consistent contact with the organization's director, with the most recent contact occurring at the end of July.

Mr. Fisher noted that this is the first time Mr. Dumas had admitted involvement in the offense and asked if he had had a drug problem at the time of the crime. Ms. Wilson said he participated in a 6-month long class drug addiction class.

Ms. Wilson noted that Mr. Dumas claims not to have known his accomplice. Ms. Power explained that Mr. Dumas and his accomplice met at a ballgame and planned the Robbery.

Mr. Brink asked about the availability of re-entry services at the cousin's house. She stated that her church is just starting a prison ministry and there would be services available to Mr. Dumas. She further noted that she is retired and has the time to assist Mr. Dumas with whatever he would need.

Mrs. Perkins suggested that St. Leonard's could supply the support needed by Mr. Dumas and felt that that would be a good transition for Mr. Dumas.

Mr. Shelton said he was not that concerned about a formal drug program, observing that Mr. Dumas's cousin is retired and able to spend time with him.

Ms. Crigler noted that Mr. Dumas's cousin lives a distance from St. Leonard's, but that she could provide social, mental, and emotional support.

The Board concluded that any grant of parole release should also include a condition of parole that requires Mr. Dumas to engage in re-entry services programming.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (EW—DWD). Motion prevails by a vote of 11–2. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Shelton, and Ms. Wilson. Mr. Ruggiero, and Mr. Tupy dissented.

After a complete review of Mr. Dumas's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Dumas, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Dumas is an appropriate candidate for parole release at this time.

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—August 27, 2020

Inmate Name: **EARL GOOD** IDOC Number: **C66268**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Earl Good C66268.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Earl Good C66268 was interviewed on June 2, 2020, at the Illinois River Correctional Center, for the purpose of parole release consideration. Mr. Good is age 72 and has been found guilty of 5 counts of Murder, with three convictions in Cook County and two in St. Claire County, with concurrent sentences of 90–180 years and 25–50 years. He appealed his case to the Illinois Appellate Court, and they affirmed the conviction and denied Mr. Good's motion to withdraw his plea of guilty.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On October 7, 1975, Mr. Good, Edward Spicer, and Donaldson Brooks went to the home of an elderly man, whom they had heard had a tendency to keep a lot of cash in the home. Mr. Good cut a hole in the window and entered the home of 73-year-old victim James Fitzpatrick. Mr. Fitzpatrick and his 76-year-old sister, who also resided with him, were both blind. Mr. Good took \$1,000.00 and went downstairs and "pistol-whipped" Mr. Fitzpatrick, a beating that later resulted in his death.

A month later, on November 10, 1975, Mr. Good and Mr. Spicer went to the Wonder Inn Tavern for the purposes of committing another Armed Robbery. Mr. Spicer had thought it would be an easy job. They entered the tavern and forced the two owners and a caretaker to line up against the wall, drop their wallets, and throw them on the pool table. Mr. Good and his accomplice forced all three to lie face down.

At that time, a Schlitz Beer deliveryman knocked on the door and Mr. Good let the deliveryman in the tavern. Mr. Good took the deliveryman to the back room and made him lie on the floor with the other victims. Mr. Good then shot all four victims; the two owners were killed.

The deliveryman later reported the events to the police, identifying both Mr. Good and Mr. Spicer. Arrest warrants were subsequently issued for both attackers.

Mr. Good and Mr. Spicer then went to East St. Louis, Illinois, where five days later, on November 15, 1975, they committed another Robbery and Murder. Both offenders, together with James Phillips, drove to a store in East St. Louis and forced the two owners to open the store and the safe. They emptied the safe of the money, then shot and killed both men, with one victim surviving long enough to call the police. When Officer Bruce Moore arrived, he was shot and severely wounded by the assailants.

Mr. Good was ultimately arrested on December 3, 1975, in Chicago. After his arrest, he gave a written statement admitting his involvement in the three separate crimes and the Murders of 5 people. He pled guilty to the three counts of Murder in Cook County and two counts of Murder in St. Clair County.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Good's juvenile history is known to the Board. In February of 1965, at the age of 18, Mr. Good was arrested and charged with Manslaughter for stabbing a young man to death after they had a heated argument. Mr. Good filed a petition for post-conviction relief, which was affirmed by the Appellate Court. He was later released on parole in July 1975. Three months later, he began his string of Murders, which are now before the Board.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Good transferred to Illinois River Correctional Center on April 25, 2007, and he is currently unassigned. He is currently on A-grade status, is designated a low escape risk, and classified as minimum security. He has received no new Inmate Disciplinary Reports since his last parole consideration hearing and has received only one IDR since being transferred to Illinois River. Since 2000, Mr. Good has received a total of only 3 tickets.

Mr. Good has made a very satisfactory adjustment since he arrived at Illinois River. He has obtained his GED, an Associate's Degree, and a Bachelor's Degree. Mr. Good additionally submitted over 40 Certificates for Religious Studies.

In the vocational area, he says he is skilled in plumbing, electrical work, welding, painting, and masonry. Mr. Good indicated that he acquired these skills while working in the maintenance department at Pontiac, Stateville, and Menard.

Mr. Good is very proud of his ability to prepare people for the boxing world. Most notably, he trained one individual who competed in the 2000 Olympics in Australia.

EN BANC HISTORY

This is the 24th time he has appeared before the Prisoner Review Board. Mr. Good indicated he has had one vote in favor of granting parole release parole in years past (records indicate this to have been in 2000). He has had numerous 3-year sets, occurring in 1984, 1989, 2004, 2007, 2010, 2013, and 2016.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

The Board noted that there is longstanding, strong protest against parole for Mr. Good.

Ms. Martinez noted that Mr. Good had claimed he was held as a political prisoner in a prior interview. She asked about his parole plan and noted that it was previously very week. She also asked if there was documentation that Mr. Good had renounced the gang. Mr. Dunn noted that in a prior interview he had done with Mr. Good, Mr. Dunn did not get the feeling that Mr. Good was done with the gang. Mr. Good did not express the political prisoner claim in his most recent interview, but Mr. Dunn also felt that Mr. Good did not have a strong parole plan.

Mr. Shelton pointed out that Mr. Good was on parole at the time of this offense. He also noted that Mr. Good was at the center of the riot at Joliet. Following that incident, gang members were separated and sent to Tamms. The investigation into Mr. Good's involvement was not completed at the end of his parole period, and he was released as a result. Thereafter, he was charged with the Murders he is currently serving time for. Mr. Shelton noted that Mr. Good was arrested because there was audio recording happening during the final Armed Robbery and Murder at the grocery store. Mr. Shelton observed that one of the reasons that Mr. Good's institutional adjustment has been as good as it has been may be due to gang leadership.

Mr. Good's attorney, Lawrence Redmond, spoke on Mr. Good's behalf. Mr. Redmond detailed Mr. Good's parole plan to the Board, explaining that Mr. Good is able to live with a cousin in Decatur and receive financial and spiritual help from other cousins. Mr. Good would also like to consider a half-way house out of Chicago. Mr. Redmond further stated that Mr. Good has never been a gang leader.

Mr. Ruggiero noted the absence of a protest letter from Cook County.

Mr. Redmond was asked about the parole plan that he mentioned, as it had not been submitted prior to the hearing. After a brief discussion between Board Members and Mr. Redmond, Prisoner Review Board Chief Legal Counsel Jason Sweat clarified that parole plans should be submitted prior to *en banc*, so that they may be fully reviewed by the Board. Mr. Sweat additionally explained that Mr. Redmond was welcome to briefly summarize the plan and two supporting letters, and that the Board would certainly receive the documents instanter, but

noted for the Board that the viability of the plan was unknown, as IDOC may not have had an opportunity to investigate and approve the plan. Mr. Sweat concluded by noting that attorney presentations at *en banc* are normally limited to addressing errors and omissions in the Board Member's presentation of the case.

Mr. Redmond stated that Mr. Good is remorseful and not the person he was in 1975. Mr. Good has "found Jesus" and has earned degrees in religion and theology. Mr. Redmond indicated that Mr. Good has already submitted a list of individuals with whom he can live to IDOC. Mr. Good was also noted for his attempts to help younger men avoid making the same life mistakes he did and to be resourceful members of society. Mr. Redmond presented letters of support for Mr. Good, and stated that Mr. Good acts as a "go-between" for interactions between IDOC Staff and "difficult" incarcerated individuals. Mr. Redmond also noted that Mr. Good is a diabetic.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (DWD—AMP). Motion prevails by a vote of 13–0.

Motion for a 3-year set (DS—JR). Motion prevails by a vote of 8–5. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson. Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, and Ms. Martinez dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Hyche's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Hyche 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—August 27, 2020

Inmate Name: **DONALD WOODRUFF** IDOC Number: **C72940**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Donald Woodruff C72940.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Donald Woodruff C72940 is a 57-year-old African American man incarcerated at Lawrence Correctional Center. He was found guilty of two counts of Murder, with one offense in Champaign County and one in DeWitt County. He was also found guilty of Armed Robbery, Aggravated Kidnapping, Theft, Unlawful Use of a Weapon, and Aggravated Battery. Mr. Woodruff was given sentences of 75–150 years and 60–100 years for the Murder offenses, with additional sentences of 15–30 years, 3–10 years, and 1–3 years imprisonment for the second set of offenses, with all sentences to run concurrently. During the course of his incarceration, Mr. Woodruff was convicted of Aggravated Battery to a Correctional Officer and given a consecutive 10-year sentence. Mr. Woodruff filed a petition for Executive Clemency in 2011 seeking a Commutation of his sentence to time served, which was denied.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In February of 1975, Mr. Woodruff was attending beauty school in Chicago, when he met Percy Lee Jones. On February 11, 1977, at approximately 1:00 a.m., in the area of 79th and Morgan Street in Chicago, Mr. Jones, armed with a sawed-off shotgun, approached Derek Smith, with the intention of stealing Mr. Smith's 1973 Buick. Mr. Woodruff acted as a lookout. Mr. Jones ordered Mr. Smith into the vehicle at gunpoint and told him to drive.

During the course of this action, Mr. Smith grabbed the barrel of the shotgun and it discharged. Mr. Smith suffered a gunshot wound to the leg, but was able to flee from the vehicle. Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Jones then fled in Mr. Smith's vehicle and drove to Champaign, Illinois.

On February 14, 1977, Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Jones drove Mr. Smith's car to Clinton, Illinois, with the plan to steal another vehicle. While in Clinton, they spotted a white Pontiac Firebird belonging to Tony Fairchild. As Mr. Fairchild approached his vehicle, both offenders

approached him, with Mr. Jones brandishing his shotgun. After being told that they wanted his car, Mr. Fairchild quickly put the keys in the vehicle and locked the doors. Both offenders became angry, ordered Fairchild into the Buick, and drove away. They then drove approximately ten miles outside of Clinton, to a deserted country road, where they forced Mr. Fairchild out of the vehicle and told him to lie face-down on the ground. He was then shot in the back of the head, and the blast nearly decapitated him. After killing Mr. Fairchild, money and personal property was removed from his body. Both offenders then drove away in the Buick and returned to Champaign County.

On February 15, 1977, Mr. Woodruff and Mr. Jones were still in Champaign, when they entered the University Avenue Auto Sales and encountered Richard Ogden, who was assistant sales manager. Once inside, they ordered Mr. Ogden at gunpoint to provide the keys and title to an Oldsmobile on the sales lot. Mr. Ogden complied and was taken to a storage room in the back of the facility, where he was then shot in the back of the head with the shotgun. After murdering Mr. Ogden, Mr. Woodruff and his co-offender took an Oldsmobile from the lot and \$800.00 from the register. The Oldsmobile broke down approximately one block from the sales lot, so they went to a local hotel in the area. While requesting the company of two females from outside the area, police investigators intervened and both offenders were arrested and subsequently charged.

On August 26, 1977, Mr. Woodruff was sentenced in Champaign County for Murder as previously stated. Six days later, he was sentenced in DeWitt County.

MR. WOODRUFF'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

When asked to share his version of the crime, Mr. Woodruff stated he met Mr. Jones while attending cosmetology school and they sometimes hung out together. Mr. Jones invited Mr. Woodruff to go to Peoria, as he said he had relatives in Peoria. They went to a lounge on 79th and Morgan. Mr. Woodruff stated he did not know Mr. Jones had shot a person. The victim, Mr. Smith, told the police Mr. Woodruff was a look out, but he states he could not have been a look out because of where the car was sitting and the location of the lounge. The victim also told the police that Mr. Woodruff had taken a tape from the victim and he knew it was his tape because he had torn a corner of the tape. A fingerprint expert testified the victim tore the label.

Mr. Woodruff then related that Mr. Jones told Mr. Woodruff that Mr. Jones knew some people in Champaign and asked Mr. Woodruff to drive to Champaign. Mr. Woodruff indicated that they were drinking and he was smoking marijuana. He drove to a town called Clinton and they stopped in a parking lot. Mr. Jones got out and came back with a white guy named Mr. Fairchild and they started smoking again and Mr. Jones asked Mr. Woodruff to drive again.

Mr. Jones said "Stop," and Mr. Jones and Mr. Fairchild got out of the car, at which point they walked out into the field and started to argue. Mr. Woodruff was sitting in the car and

listening to the tape player, and he heard a muffled sound. He did not see Mr. Fairchild, but Mr. Jones was coming back with a gun in his hand and got in the front seat.

Mr. Woodruff noted that the body of the victim was found in the snow in rural Dewitt County. There were two sets of footprints leading to the scene and one set of size 9 footprints returning from the scene. Mr. Woodruff wears a size 11 shoe and Mr. Jones wears a size 9. Mr. Woodruff stated that this supports his version of events, and that he did not Murder Mr. Fairchild. Mr. Woodruff further stated he asked Mr. Jones, "Man! Why did you do that?" and that Mr. Jones replied "I had to do that."

Mr. Woodruff went on to state that the first thing he was thinking was that he had to get away from this nut. He knew where Mr. Woodruff lived so he had to make a plan to get away. Mr. Jones told Mr. Woodruff to drive back to Champaign, and, when they got there the next day, Mr. Woodruff was still trying to come up with a plan to get away from Mr. Jones. Mr. Woodruff then went to a liquor store. Mr. Jones went into the car lot while Mr. Woodruff purchased the liquor. Mr. Woodruff heard something that sounded like a backfire, and Mr. Jones came back and asked Mr. Woodruff to drive Mr. Jones's new car.

Mr. Woodruff stated that he never went into the car lot and that when he heard the gunshot, he was standing in front of the liquor store clerk purchasing some liquor. He further stated that the testimony of the liquor store clerk in Champaign County and Mr. Jones's confession when arrested confirmed that Mr. Woodruff did not kill the victim in the car lot.

Notes from the appellate opinion regarding Mr. Woodruff's case state that "The people never contended that the case against [Mr.] Woodruff rested on him being the shooter." A close examination of the closing arguments presented in the case indicate that at no time did the people assert that Mr. Woodruff was in fact the man who actually fired the shot which killed the victim, Mr. Ogden. On at least one occasion during closing argument, the prosecutor expressly told the jury that no evidence had been presented on this point and that the jury could not possibly conclude who fired the fatal shot. The closing argument reveals that the prosecution's case against Woodruff, as well as its presentation to the jury, depended exclusively on Mr. Woodruff's guilt under the principles of accountability and Felony Murder.

Mr. Woodruff indicated that at that point he was afraid of Mr. Jones, so Mr. Woodruff drove the car and they went to Peoria and got a hotel room in the Washington Inn. They were in the Inn and Mr. Woodruff was sitting on a chair, looking at the television, when Mr. Jones pointed a gun at Mr. Woodruff. Mr. Woodruff slapped Mr. Jones, and the gun went off. Mr. Woodruff stated that he knew then that Mr. Jones was going to kill Mr. Woodruff.

About four hours later, Mr. Woodruff was driving around, and the police stopped him. The two co-offenders were driving separate cars, and Mr. Jones had also been stopped; Mr. Jones told the police that Mr. Woodruff had killed some people and that he was going to kill anyone who got in his way. Mr. Woodruff stated that he did not shoot anyone; the liquor storeowner told

the police Mr. Woodruff was with him when Mr. Jones shot Mr. Ogden. Mr. Woodruff stated that Mr. Jones was the shooter in both Murders and that Mr. Woodruff was convicted on accountability.

Mr. Woodruff was asked why he decided to spend time with Mr. Jones, and Mr. Woodruff stated it was due to peer pressure and because he wanted to be accepted by people. Mr. Jones was lying to Mr. Woodruff all the time they were friends and together on the trip. Mr. Woodruff stated that he just wanted to do something on the weekend. He stated his mistake was not reporting what he saw, but Mr. Woodruff did not want to go to the police because he viewed them as not wanting to help poor black people. Mr. Woodruff stated that he regrets that he did not say anything, and when he thinks about the victim's mother, he is so sorry and wants to tell her that he could not save her son's life.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

There are no delinquency findings. There is a 1975 case reported of an Aggravated Battery with a Firearm that was subsequently dismissed, after conviction for the instant offenses.

Mr. Woodruff's version of the 1975 crime is as follows: in February of 1975, he was a 17-year-old student at Chicago Vocational High School, located at 2100 East 87th street. The victim of his crime was a 26-year-old gang leader, who had been robbing Mr. Woodruff and two friends. Mr. Woodruff stated he had been taking his father's gun to school for protection. On February 3, 1975, he and his two friends were at a fast food restaurant next door to the school. The victim, Thomas Greene, and his gang attempted to rob Mr. Woodruff and his friends, and Mr. Woodruff shot Mr. Greene out of fear, before Mr. Woodruff then ran back to the school and told his band teacher, Harold Bray, what had happened. The police were called, and Judge Marovich set a low bond because of the circumstances. Mr. Greene refused to appear for trial on numerous dates and the case was continued until Mr. Woodruff's arrest in February of 1977. In 1977, as an adult, he received a sentence of four years of probation for an Aggravated Battery conviction.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Woodruff was born in Gary, Indiana, in 1957. He was the oldest of three children, two boys and one girl. Both parents are now deceased. The family moved to Chicago in the early 1960s and Mr. Woodruff attended Yale Elementary School; he later graduated from Parkside Elementary school in 1971. He attended Chicago Vocational High School and graduated in 1975. He was to enter college at Grambling University on a band scholarship, but due to the Aggravated Battery charge, Mr. Woodruff claims the Judge told Mr. Woodruff he could not go to school out-of-state. Therefore, he worked for his father and later started a produce business for six months. Mr. Woodruff then worked at Trumbalt Asphalt Company for six months, after which he enrolled in Mr. Lestee's School of Cosmetology, where Mr. Woodruff also worked as an employee. There is no record of military service and he has never been married.

Mr. Woodruff has been in the following institutions: entered Joliet (1977), then later transferred to Menard (1977), Pontiac (1978), Menard (1982), Pontiac (1983), Menard (1987), Stateville (1988), Menard (1989), Stateville (2013), and Lawrence (2020), where Mr. Woodruff is currently housed.

He has received over 200 tickets since he entered the prison system. His last ticket was in May of 2013, wherein he was found guilty of Bribery and Extortion while working as a law library clerk. He was also found guilty of Intimidation and Threats in this incident, as it was found he was bullying younger, smaller inmates into giving up commissary in exchange for law library work he performed for then. Mr. Woodruff currently has no job assignment. He claims that he is a victim of prison guards and personnel trying to stop him from researching and from writing letters alleging the wrongdoings going on in prison. Mr. Woodruff claims that some individuals lost their jobs due to his writings, and that they are out to get him. He denies the Bribery and Extortion charges. For the Bribery and Extortion offenses, he received 3 months on C-grade status; for the Intimidation and Threats offenses, he received 3 months of yard and audiovisual restrictions. Mr. Woodruff also states he does not need to bribe for commissary, because his family supports him.

Mr. Woodruff has received the following certificates:

- Employment Interview Techniques in Human Resource Development Life Skills Joliet Junior College 1981
- Entry-level paralegal program Southern Career Institute 1990
- Diploma of Paralegal Specialized Practices Program 1992
- Home Bible Studies Gospel Echoes Team 2001
- Bible Correspondence Course Certificate Hope Aglow Ministries 2002
- Associate of Old Testament History from Amherst Theological Seminary 2003
- Certificate of Achievement Bible Correspondence 2005
- Business Management Diploma 2009
- Substance Abuse Intervention Program 2012
- Certificate of Completion for TRACI 2013

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Woodruff has been accepted at St. Leonard's, where he would receive supportive services to assist with his reentry. After St Leonard's, he plans to live with his brother, and to continue his paralegal studies and become a paralegal.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton stated that he had read the trial transcripts from both Champaign and DeWitt counties. They indicate that Mr. Woodruff went to a bank and cashed out change belonging to a victim. Mr. Woodruff claims that he was not involved, but instead is innocent. Mr. Shelton stated that Mr. Woodruff was the one who approached an East Peoria hotel maintenance worker about the possibility of putting a stereo in a car they had stolen.

Ms. Martinez noted that Mr. Woodruff has received 200 tickets, and that among the charges are Intimidation and other violence. Ms. Crigler stated that she believes some of his anger is explained by a 1978 alleged beating at Pontiac by a corrections officer. Mr. Woodruff was charged in the incident and received a 10-year sentence for what he says was self-defense. It was noted that the officers involved in the incident where he was charged have been disciplined.

Ms. Crigler stated that Mr. Woodruff is remorseful for the victim's deaths, noting that he was afraid of his codefendant. Ms. Crigler observed that Mr. Woodruff now focuses on religious and legal studies.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (EC—DWD). Motion prevails by a vote of 8–5. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Ms. Harris, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, and Ms. Wilson. Mr. Fisher, Mr. James, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, and Mr. Tupy dissented.

After a complete review of Mr. Woodruff's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Woodruff, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Dumas is an appropriate candidate for parole release at this time.

"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—August 27, 2020

Inmate Name: **THOMAS FULLER** IDOC Number: **C10244**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on August 27, 2020, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Thomas Fuller C10244.

Members present were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson.

Recording Secretary: Janet Crane.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Thomas Fuller C10244 was interviewed via videoconference on July 21, 2020, at 10:23 a.m. Present at the interview were Board Member Mrs. Perkins and Mr. Fuller.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On April 27, 1968, Mr. Fuller shot and killed five children with a .22 caliber pistol. The victims were Louis Cox, Theresa Jean Cox, Mary Catherine Cox, Gary Lee Cox, and Kenneth Cox. The victims were all siblings of Louise Cox, who was the 17-year-old girlfriend of Mr. Fuller. Louis was the twin of brother of Louise.

Mr. Fuller pled not guilty and raised the defense of insanity. The court appointed three experts to examine Mr. Fuller in order to determine whether he was competent to stand trial. Mr. Fuller was found competent to stand trial and was ultimately convicted of five counts of Murder, with one count for each of the five children. On December 10, 1968, Mr. Fuller was sentenced to 70–99 years, with three counts of Murder to be served consecutively, for a total of 140–198 years of incarceration.

Mr. Fuller appealed his case, which the Appellate Court denied, and the Illinois Supreme Court declined to hear. Mr. Fuller's prior request for Executive Clemency was also denied.

MR. FULLER'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

Mr. Fuller stated his family was very transitory and his father and mother were very mean. He was a loner, because every time he made friends they were moving. When his parents finally separated, he decided to stay with his mother, because of his younger brother. He tried to shelter his younger brother from the acts of their mother. In high school, he met a young lady,

Louise Cox, and he fell in love. Mr. Fuller stated that he felt as though she was mistreated at home. She was the one who had to do all the chores, and the rest of the family was lazy, so he was planning to run away with Louise.

The day of the crime, Mr. Fuller went over to the Cox house in time to hear an argument between Louis and Louise; Louise was crying and Mr. Fuller could not help her. So, when Louis (whom Mr. Fuller hated) came out of the house, Mr. Fuller suggested that he and Louis go target shooting together. Louis agreed and brought his two brothers with him. Mr. Fuller shot all three. He panicked after he realized what he had done. Mr. Fuller stated he went in the house to get the two girls and shot them also, because he was afraid they would start screaming, and it would not give him enough time to plan his next move. Mr. Fuller got a ride into town and surrendered when police caught up with him.

MR. FULLER'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

Mr. Fuller states that he sincerely regrets his actions and that every night when he goes to bed, he can still see the faces of the victims of his crime. He stated that all his years of "pent up" rage exploded on the Cox children. Mr. Fuller says he has asked God to forgive him and he has written to Louise asking her to forgive him, but he is not sure she ever got the letter.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

No additional criminal history was noted in Mr. Fuller's case; the instant Murder are his first and only offenses.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

In 1968, Mr. Fuller was assigned to Stateville Correctional Center. He has previously been in Menard and is now serving time in Graham, where he has been since 1980. He has always maintained A-grade status. Mr. Fuller has had two minor tickets in 52 years; one in 2003 and one in 2007. Mr. Fuller has had lots of jobs in the institutions, including commissary worker, clothing worker, laundry worker, and mechanical store worker.

Mr. Fuller's SPIN Assessment results show he has an overall low risk to re-offend. Mr. Fuller was given a comprehensive evaluation as to his mental status in August 2019, with no mental health diagnoses; he is functioning well in IDOC. Mr. Fuller has earned a college degree since he has been incarcerated. He is a loner, and reports that he enjoys working alone and keeps busy working. He enjoys reading and running.

Mr. Fuller was 18 at the time of the offense, he is 70 years old now. He has been incarcerated for 52 years and 3 months. Mr. Fuller was pleasant at the interview and appeared to be in good health. He was very eager to talk and tell his side of the story, in addition to the extensive writing he previously provided to the Board regarding his life story and the crime.

EN BANC HISTORY

Mr. Fuller's first approach before the Board was in 1978; this is his 19th parole consideration hearing before the Board.

PAROLE PLANS

Although Mr. Fuller has had an excellent institutional adjustment and has done very well since being incarcerated, his parole plans are weak. Mr. Fuller says he plans to move to Maine with an aunt and uncle. Currently, however, he has not applied for the interstate compact. It was suggested to Mr. Fuller that he contact halfway houses who accept incarcerated individuals with lengthy sentences, who would help him transition back into society.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mrs. Perkins noted that Mr. Fuller sincerely regrets his actions and has asked for forgiveness.

The Board noted that there have been voluminous protests against release.

Mr. Ruggiero noted that Mr. Fuller was found fit to stand trial and pled guilty.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (AMP—PF). Motion prevails by a vote of 12–1. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Fisher, Ms. Harris, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, Mr. Tupy, and Ms. Wilson. Mr. Dunn dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Fuller's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that a release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as 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."