

EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—February 25 & 26, 2021

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 25, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for the following offenders:

C82540	LARRY KURENA*	C90056	VIRGIL ROBINSON*
C15434	JOSEPH HURST*	C82430	SALIK ABDULLAH
C81919	MICHAEL HENDERSON*	C91336	EARL ALLEN*
A73403	DENNIS CARTER* **	C15189	FRANK MORGAN*
C01600	JOHNNY VEAL*		

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Findley.

Roll call was taken by Recording Secretary Tracy Buckley.

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

12 Members Present

The Recording Secretary presented the September 24, 2020, Open Session Minutes for approval.

Motion to approve Open Session Minutes from September 24, 2020. (JR—DS). Leave.

The Board heard and voted upon the cases of Larry Kurena, Joseph Hurst, Michael Henderson, Dennis Carter, and Johnny Veal as detailed in the individual case minutes.



Motion to recess overnight. (KW-DS). Leave.

Chairman Findley called the Board back from recess at 9:00 a.m. on February 26, 2021.

The Board heard and voted upon the cases of Virgil Robinson, Salik Abdullah, Earl Allen, and Frank Morgan as detailed in the individual case minutes.

Meeting was adjourned (AP-JR). Leave.



EN BANC MINUTE SHEET OPEN SESSION—February 25, 2021

Inmate Name: LARRY KURENA IDOC Number: C82540

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 25, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Larry Kurena C82540.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Larry Kurena C82540 was interviewed on February 18, 2021, via video conference from Danville Correctional Center. Present for the interview were his attorneys, Lillian McCartin and Brad Thomson. Also present were Ron and Mary Marek, Jessica Isaac, and Joseph Kurena. Mr. Kurena was very cooperative and engaging throughout the interview. Prisoner Review Board Member Daniel Brink was also present.

Mr. Kurena is currently incarcerated at the Danville Correctional Center, where he has been since November 19, 2014. He currently is a minimum-security offender and has been on A grade status since May 9, 2013. He is a moderate escape risk. His SPIN Assessment, completed on May 10, 2016, is overall high.

Mr. Kurena was last heard in December of 2019, at which time he received seven votes in favor of release. He previously had received votes in favor of release as follows: three votes in February of 2019, five votes in December of 2018, three votes in 2017, four votes in 2016, and four votes in 2015. Prior to that, Mr. Kurena had not received any votes in favor of granting release since his return as a parole violator. Mr. Kurena was granted parole by the Board in 1993. This will be Mr. Kurena's 11th parole consideration hearing since his return as a violator.

On January 23, 2002, in Sangamon County, Illinois, Mr. Kurena was sentenced to 1 year of supervision for DUI.

On March 20, 2004 Mr. Kurena was found guilty of Violation of an Order of Protection in Sangamon County, Illinois, and sentenced to 6 days in jail.



On September 20, 2004, in Fulton County, Indiana, Mr. Kurena pled guilty to Receiving Stolen Property and was sentenced to 3 years in the Department of Corrections, with the first 2.5 years suspended, and placed on probation.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On March 12, 1976, Mr. Kurena, then age 17, spent the afternoon drinking and taking pills with friends. At approximately 11:00 pm, John Shannon, Jr., a friend of Mr. Kurena's, came to his apartment and was extremely intoxicated. They left Mr. Kurena's apartment to purchase some cannabis at a nearby tavern. Mr. Kurena was involved in a fight while inside the tavern, but was persuaded to leave by his friends. He then went back to his apartment and armed himself with a nine-inch butcher knife. They then left the apartment again, returning to the tavern area (alley), where Mr. Shannon, Sr., was requesting help from John Taylor and Emil Lauridsen (the two victims) to help carry Mr. Shannon, Jr., home to sleep it off. As Mr. Shannon, Sr., Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Lauridsen carried Mr. Shannon, Jr., home, Mr. Kurena and others approached and began to yell obscenities at the individuals. The police arrived and quelled the disturbance, then left. As Mr. Taylor and Mr. Lauridsen were returning to the tavern, Mr. Kurena approached the two and stabbed both men with the butcher knife in the abdomen, leaving the knife in one of the victims. Both men died from the knife wounds. Mr. Kurena and his friends all fled the area in a vehicle. The police arrived and recovered the bodies, along with the butcher knife. Mr. Kurena was apprehended after a two-and-a-half-block foot chase.

It was reported that when Mr. Kurena entered the vehicle with his friends, he stated he just killed both men and left the knife in "Moono" (Mr. Taylor's nickname). Mr. Kurena further stated he did not know why he killed them, because "Moono" was his friend. Mr. Taylor was an extremely popular individual in the community, and at one point even helped Mr. Kurena get a job. The victims, Mr. Taylor and Mr. Lauridsen, had a park dedicated to their memory in 1976.

The Pathology Report dated March 13, 1976, by the Cook County Coroner revealed that each victim suffered a single stab wound to the abdomen.

STATEMENT OF FACTS AS TO THE PAROLE VIOLATION

On April 25, 2005, Mr. Kurena was returned to Stateville Correctional Center. The Parole Violation Report indicated non-compliance with "Rule 1" (violation of any criminal statute). The report stated that Mr. Kurena was approved to reside in the State of Indiana in August of 2004. He was arrested on September 20, 2004, for felony Theft, after being found in possession of tools that had been reported stolen. The violation report also alleged that on March 29, 2005, Mr. Kurena violated an Order of Protection in Springfield, Illinois, by calling his ex-wife on at least 10 occasions. The report further stated that Mr. Kurena told his ex-wife he knew she was dating a Chicago Police Officer, and that Mr. Kurena didn't have a problem killing a cop. Additionally, the report stated he told his ex-wife he was coming to Springfield, and she was going to be the first to go before he took their son. Mr. Kurena also failed to report to his agent



on April 11, 2005; when he left a message, the agent was unable to understand the contents, with the audio of Mr. Kurena's message indicating that he was intoxicated.

MR. KURENA'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSES

Mr. Kurena stated most of what was reported in the Statement of Facts was true. He stated he was not in a fight earlier at the tavern as reported. He stated he arrived in the alley, and thought his older brother was having an argument with the two victims. Mr. Kurena stated he stabbed the men, and that to this day he doesn't know why he did it. He also stated he has no logical explanation why he took the knife from his apartment, other than surmising it was for protection. He stated he was highly intoxicated and had been taking pills prior to the offenses.

Mr. Kurena stated he is very remorseful for his actions and taking the life of Mr. Taylor and Mr. Laursiden. Mr. Kurena stated Mr. Taylor was a friend and even helped Mr. Kurena get his first job. He stated Mr. Taylor was a great guy. Mr. Kurena stated he thinks about the victims every day, and that he will never forget what he did. He stated they never should have lost their lives because of his stupidity and drinking.

MR. KURENA'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE PAROLE VIOLATIONS

Mr. Kurena stated that he did call his ex-wife numerous times, which he stated was because he was allowed to call to talk with his son as part of the divorce agreement. He stated she didn't answer, so he did keep calling. As to the threatening statements to her and about the Chicago Police Officer, he said it was just a statement and had no meaning, but did acknowledge that he had made the statements.

Mr. Kurena stated the stolen tools were a gift from a friend who he helped move. He stated he would go to the cemetery to visit his dad's grave, and he was out of money and gas, so he asked the neighbor next to the cemetery if he could sell them some tools. He stated his truck was full of different tools, as he worked construction, and they picked a single socket set and gave him \$5.00.

Mr. Kurena stated he pled guilty to Receiving Stolen Property in Indiana, as he claims that he was assured by his Illinois parole agent that his parole would not be a violated due to the criminal conviction. A copy of the Indiana Presentence Investigation report dated April 1, 2005, provided by Mr. Kurena's current attorney, Ms. McCartin, indicated he plead guilty pursuant to the terms of a plea agreement. The report stated, "This officer has had a conversation with the Defendant's parole officer, Nancy Bowman, who indicated that Illinois would not file a parole violation due to the current charges".

Additionally, Mr. Kurena was questioned regarding a previous Prisoner Review Board discussion which indicated that he had submitted a false affidavit regarding the stolen tools.



When questioned, Mr. Kurena stated the affidavit was accurate and it only verified the individual never told him the tools were stolen.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Kurena has had an excellent adjustment since his return in 2005. Mr. Kurena is a minimum security, moderate escape risk offender, who has been on A grade status since May 9, 2013. Mr. Kurena has a high school education, as well as 40 credit hours from Belleville Area College. He has participated in numerous vocational programs, which included welding, business, bookkeeping, and typing. He also completed courses in anger management in 2019, domestic violence in 2019, and substance use disorder in 2016. He stated he also attended weekly Alcoholics Anonymous meetings since his return in 2005. He provided documentation of attending weekly AA meetings in 2018. Mr. Kurena is currently unassigned, but he has previously worked the following assignments: housing unit janitor, maintenance, carpenter, painter, and floor specialist. He has only received one ticket since returning to the Department of Corrections, in 2005, which was for refusing housing.

Prior to his release in 1993, Mr. Kurena had 12 disciplinary reports in IDOC, with no violence noted. He received 30 days in segregation in 1984 for Contraband. He additionally held job assignments as a locksmith and shoe-shiner.

Mr. Kurena stated that, after his release in 1993, he maintained regular contact with his parole agent while residing in Springfield, Illinois. He stated at one point his parole agent recommended him to be successfully discharged from parole, but that the recommendation was denied. This has been verified by a Memorandum dated March 7, 2005, from Nancy Bowman, Parole Agent. Mr. Kurena stated he started to experience problems with drinking after about eight years on parole. He stated he started drinking about the same time as his separation and divorce. Mr. Kurena stated he completed the Gateway Substance Abuse program in Springfield, as it was recommended by his parole agent. He stated that, after he completed the 90-day program, he continued to have some problems, and his parole agent recommended he move to Indiana. He stated he maintained employment throughout his term of parole. He was returned to IDOC as a parole violator after 11 years.

Mr. Kurena reported he is in overall good health, but that he suffers from a deteriorating hip joint, which causes constant pain and some difficulty walking. He stated he takes regular pain medication and would require hip replacement in the future.

Mr. Kurena stated he is in good mental health.

On February 20, 2020, a "Current Psychiatric Evaluation" was completed at the request of the Board. The report indicated that Mr. Kurena had no current diagnosable mental health issues, and that he was functioning well. The report also noted that Mr. Kurena had a positive attitude, worked, was pursuing education, and had maintained good interpersonal relationships in



the institution. Mr. Kurena also had an evaluation completed in 2011; he did not meet criteria for a mental health diagnosis at that time. It was reported he has taken mediation for short periods of time in 1981 and 2005, for depressive symptoms, and in 2010, for anxiety.

Mr. Kurena is the son of Joseph and Geraldine. He stated his father passed away in 1973, and his mother is 85 years of age and resides in Wisconsin. He has seven siblings, of which three are deceased. Two sisters reside in Wisconsin, one brother in Indiana, and another brother in Chicago. Mr. Kurena stated he maintains contact with his siblings, but that he is close to his brother Joe, who resides in Chicago. Mr. Kurena stated he was raised in Chicago and had a normal childhood up until the age of 15. He stated that from age 15 until the time of his arrest, he basically lived on the streets. He was involved with Juvenile Court and DCFS, as he was running away from home and not being properly supervised.

Mr. Kurena was married, for approximately 10 years in the 1980s, while he was incarcerated. Mr. Kurena's spouse had four children, and he currently maintains regular contact with one of his stepdaughters.

Mr. Kurena later married again while living in Danville, before later divorcing in 2002. Mr. Kurena stated he has one son, age 25, whom he has not spoken with since his reincarceration in 2005. He stated he would send his son letters, but stopped, as his son was later added to the Order of Protection which included his wife.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Kurena has a strong parole plan to address his needs if granted parole. He would request to reside with his friend, the Mareks, in Chicago. The Mareks have been lifelong friends of Mr. Kurena's, are retired, and are willing to help. Mr. Kurena will receive outpatient drug and alcohol treatment through Gateway Foundation. He will initially complete an assessment and has pledged to follow the recommendations. Currently, outpatient services are remote, and they are meeting with most patients several times per week. This has been verified via a letter from the Gateway Foundation in the Chicago area. Additionally, Mr. Kurena indicates he will continue to attend AA meetings at two local churches within walking distance of the Mareks home.

Mr. Kurena has been accepted by P & S Evolutions to participate in professional counseling services offered by Dr. Darlene Perry, a clinical and forensic psychologist with an emphasis on reentry. Dr. Perry will meet with Mr. Kurena and develop a comprehensive plan, which would include substance use disorder treatment.

Mr. Kurena has also been offered employment at Skyblue Express Trucking company. He will be responsible for conducting dispatch and other office responsibilities. This has been verified via a letter from the owner of Skyblue.



Mr. Kurena also indicated that he could alternatively reside with his brother Joe in the Chicago area. Joe was present for the interview and expressed his desire to help his brother. Joe stated he will help to ensure Mr. Kurena follows the parole plan and reintegrates successfully.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

There continue to be strong objections to granting parole. Numerous friends and family members of both victims have opposed Mr. Kurena's re-release. The Cook County State's Attorney's Office has also consistently protested against release for Mr. Kurena, including via a formal letter of objection to release filed prior to the 2021 hearing.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton asked if Mr. Kurena claimed he went and retrieved the knife for protection, and Mr. Brink confirmed that was Mr. Kurena's claim. Mr. Shelton then noted that Mr. Kurena got the knife after he had already been in a bar fight.

Mr. Fisher stated that Mr. Kurena was released in 1993 and observed that there was significant controversy around that release decision, because Mr. Kurena was released so early in his sentence. Mr. Fisher stated that Mr. Kurena went to great lengths to move across the street from his ex-wife, in order to harass her. Mr. Fisher also noted that when Mr. Kurena was questioned about his statement regarding killing a police officer, he stated, "It's just a comment, and everybody makes comments like that." Mr. Kurena told Mr. Fisher in a prior interview that he knew Mr. Fisher's background as a police officer. Mr. Fisher stated that Mr. Kurena is a manipulative person and was a terrible alcoholic. Mr. Fisher stated that Mr. Kurena went to get the treatment when he felt was necessary in order to convince the Board to parole him again.

Chairman Findley asked for a review of the votes and Mr. Brink re-stated the votes.

Ms. Martinez inquired as to whether Mr. Kurena could still have a drinking problem.

Mr. Brink stated that Mr. Kurena has been incarcerated for the last 16 years.

Mr. Shelton stated that he had previously voted both to release and not to release Mr. Kurena, and that Mr. Shelton had presented the case twice. He voted against Mr. Kurena because he presented a fictitious affidavit to the Board. Mr. Shelton noted that Mr. Kurena states that the theft wasn't that big a deal, but the affidavit was a shabby handwritten thing by his friend stating that the friend gave him the tools. The timing in the affidavit was impossible, however. Mr. Shelton stated he received a copy of the police report, and Mr. Kurena is now claiming a different story.



Mr. Shelton also reported that Mr. Kurena sought to talk to Mr. Shelton about why Mr. Shelton didn't vote in favor of parole; they spoke when Mr. Shelton went to Danville. When Mr. Shelton brought up the false affidavit, Mr. Kurena just smiled and stated that he knew the affidavit was bogus, but stated that his attorney thought it was a good idea. Mr. Shelton stated that the affidavit may not be the reason Mr. Kurena doesn't get paroled, but it is important.

Ms. Crigler asked for clarification as to whether Mr. Kurena would be heard on the violation or whether he was being heard for everything. Chief Legal Counsel Jason Sweat clarified that the hearing included everything that has occurred regarding his case, including the period prior to his initial parole, his time on parole, and his time in custody since his parole was revoked.

Ms. Martinez stated that Mrs. Kurena had an Order of Protection, because Mr. Kurena was sending letters to his wife through other people; he was skirting the law. This had occurred more than one time, and that is the reason Ms. Martinez has voted against him in the past. Mr. Fisher also noted concerns relating to the Order of Protection. Ms. Crigler asked if the Order of Protection was still in force; it was confirmed that there is no current, active Order.

Attorney McCartin stated that Mr. Kurena is addressing his issues. Mr. Kurena understands he had an alcohol problem. Mr. Kurena has had several deaths in his family due to alcohol. He knows he needs to address it. He has been enrolled in an outpatient program and will have an assessment. Attorney McCartin stated that, regarding Mr. Fisher's comment, Mr. Kurena had relapsed, and he did a 90-day treatment program. He understands he must deal with this problem with alcohol.

Attorney McCartin continues to state that Mr. Kurena was violated in 2004. She is unaware of the affidavit Mr. Shelton spoke of. Mr. Kurena's previous attorney, Benjamin Butler, presented it and it had been located in a file. She also noted that in 1993 the Board found that to release him on parole would not deprecate the seriousness of the offense. Attorney McCartin further stated that Mr. Kurena grew up in a chaotic family. She stated that he has strong remorse and is committed to his success. His plans to live within walking distance of Alcoholics Anonymous meetings and to secure employment. He will be participating in outpatient treatment at Gateway. He will also continue work with his doctor. Attorney McCartin stated that she believes he is great candidate for parole at this time.

Mr. Fisher asked Attorney McCartin if Mr. Kurena would be going to back to his old neighborhood. Attorney McCartin stated that he will not be returning to that neighborhood.

Mr. Shelton stated that Mr. Kurena doesn't have a lot of tickets; he has had only 30 tickets in all of the years of his incarceration. Mr. Shelton observed that Mr. Kurena is not the worst inmate the Board has seen; however, Mr. Shelton believes Mr. Kurena is dishonest and has an alcohol problem, noting that Mr. Kurena was drunk as a skunk most of time. Mr. Shelton stated that if Mr. Kurena conquers that problem, he may not have further issues. Mr. Shelton



concluded by noting that although Mr. Kurena is dishonest, that shouldn't necessarily be the reason he is not granted parole release.

Chairman Findley asked the protestors to speak.

Ms. Ronda Dible stated that she was the niece of Mr. Lauridsen. She stated that her mother passed after the last *en banc* hearing, so she would be speaking on behalf of each family. She stated that she had a very heavy heart and acknowledged that some Members had heard personal statements at Danville Correctional Center, at the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, and in the media. She also noted that Board Members may have also seen the autopsy photos showing her uncle's body nearly cut in half. She stated that there have been hours of debates regarding the stolen tools, and things have changed over the years, including Mr. Kurena's story. However, she noted, what has not changed is the truth: Mr. Kurena willfully and with full intent killed two men; he was tried and sentenced; he appealed the case, and it was upheld that he would serve 200–300 years. She stated that he was given a gift that mysteriously allowed him to end up on the streets again, and he was able to have children; her uncle couldn't. Mr. Kurena proved he had an inability to conform to society without walls. After multiple violations he was returned to being behind the walls, which helped him to conform – he does well there. Ms. Dible noted that Mr. Kurena's attorney stated "we" will help him; Ms. Dible stated that she believes Ms. Marek is a good person, but that Mr. Kurena lies to the Board and manipulates the process. Ms. Dible stated that he will lie to your face if he thinks that it will get him where he wants to go. She asked the Board to look at the big picture and keep him where he is safe, and where society is safe. She stated that she is requesting a 2-year set.

Ms. Lori Katich stated that she is the youngest niece of Emil Lauridsen. She stated that not everyone in the family could appear. She stated that Mr. Kurena is behind bars, and that is where he is safe. She stated that she is not sure she can trust him without those walls. Ms. Katich also noted that her mother had passed away since the last hearing. Ms. Katich observed that Mr. Kurena changes his story, and stated that the Board thinks it may just be about a theft, but he will go on; her family can't. Ms. Katich stated that her family wants Mr. Kurena to remain in jail.

Ms. Dible further stated that nine of her uncle's internal organs were damaged, as he was stabbed across and in his chest. She noted that Mr. Kurena stated that he "poked" the men, instead of stating that he had stabbed them.

Chairman Findley stated that he normally shows deference to a prior Board decision, but that he and the Board need to be mindful of what has occurred since then.



DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (DB—EC). Motion prevails by a vote of 8–4. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Chairman Findley, Mr. James, Mrs. Perkins, and Ms. Wilson. Mr. Fisher, Ms. Martinez, Mr. Ruggiero, and Mr. Shelton dissented.

After a complete review of Mr. Kurena's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Kurena, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Kurena 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—February 25, 2021

Inmate Name: JOSEPH HURST IDOC Number: C15434

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 25, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Joseph Hurst C15434.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

On September 10, 2020, Joseph Hurst C15434 was interviewed at Dixon Correctional Center via video conference. Present for the interview were his attorney, Aviva Futorian, paralegal, Ken Berry, wife, Zubaydan, son, Abdullah, and friend, Howard Saffold. Mr. Hurst was cooperative and responsive throughout the interview.

Mr. Hurst has been eligible for parole since 1977. He is coming off a three-year set. Mr. Hurst did not receive any votes in favor of release in 2017, 2014, or 2013; he received votes in favor of release as follows: three votes in 2012, five votes in 2009, five votes in 2008, five votes in 2007, six votes in 2006, and five votes in 2005. He received his first favorable vote in 1982.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On May 23, 1967, Chicago Police Officers Herman Stallworth and Eugene Ervin were on routine patrol in their squad car when they saw an automobile speeding at 60 miles per hour in a 30 mile per hour zone. The officers pulled the vehicle over on the South side of Chicago. The car was being driven by Mr. Hurst, and there was one passenger, Charles Harper. After determining that Mr. Hurst did not have a driver's license, Officer Stallworth took Mr. Hurst and the passenger to the squad car. Officer Stallworth began to search Mr. Hurst, while Officer Ervin entered the squad car to use the police radio. A witness saw Mr. Hurst pull out a gun and shoot Officer Stallworth twice, and the officer Ervin once. Officer Stallworth sustained one gunshot wound to the upper left chest and one gunshot wound to the lower right side; he was pronounced dead upon arrival at Billings Hospital. Officer Ervin sustained a gunshot wound to the left side of his face and was in serious condition. Additional officers followed Mr. Hurst to an apartment building, where he locked himself in a 3rd floor washroom. Detective Hederman and Officer Coleman ordered Mr. Hurst out of the room, at which point Mr. Hurst then fired his gun at the



officers. Both Officers returned fire, and Mr. Hurst, upon discovering his gun was empty, threw the handgun out of the room. Mr. Hurst resisted arrest and was subdued and placed in custody.

MR. HURST'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Hurst stated he accepts the basic facts of the case. He stated, "At this stage in my life I have nothing to hide, I don't deny I was a very destructive individual at the time." He stated he was in possession of the .38 caliber semi-automatic handguns for approximately two months, and this was the first time he fired the weapon. Mr. Hurst stated when he ran to the apartment building, he did fire at the officers once and did tell them "I have six more shots come and get me." He stated the gun had more bullets in it when he threw it out of the room. Mr. Hurst stated his conscience told him to throw it out. He reported that when he exited the room, he didn't resist arrest, but was beaten by the officers.

Mr. Hurst stated he is very remorseful for what he did and how it has affected the victims' families. He stated he is still asking himself why he did this. Mr. Hurst's only explanation is that he was living outside of God's grace at the time. He also stated that, at the time of the offenses, he was caught up in the cultural revolution going on in Chicago in the late 60s. He stated he was not a member of the Black Panthers, but that he was influenced by the movement. He stated that at that time Black people started to have a voice and were proud to be Black.

Mr. Hurst stated that after he was incarcerated, he continued to ask himself why he committed this crime, and what he should do about it. He stated the only answer was that he offended God, and he needed to work to get back into God's grace and mercy. He stated he then converted to the Islamic faith while in the Cook County Jail. Mr. Hurst stated his faith has been his main focus throughout his incarceration, and he continues to grow daily. He stated he will only know on Judgment Day if his work has been accepted by God.

PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Hurst was on probation at the time of the instant offenses. He was sentenced to 3 years of probation for two counts of Armed Robbery. Records reflect that he and a co-defendant robbed two CTA bus drivers by demanding money. No weapon was displayed. His probation was revoked for the instant offenses, and he was resentenced to 10–20 years, which was to run consecutively.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Hurst is currently incarcerated at Dixon Correctional Center, where he has been since October 11, 2006. Mr. Hurst is A grade status, minimum security, and a low escape risk. His SPIN Assessment, completed in 2017, was overall low. He is currently unassigned.



Mr. Hurst is the son of Elena Hurst and is the oldest of four children. He stated he never had a relationship or contact with his father. He was born and raised in the Chicago area. Mr. Hurst stated they lived in a one-room apartment until he was 12 years of age when they moved to "the projects." He stated he maintains a good relationship with his siblings, and they are supportive of his parole and willing to help in his transition.

Mr. Hurst stated he graduated from high school in 1961, and then attended Iowa State University for three years and SIU Carbondale for one year. He played basketball all four years, but is a few credits short of receiving his bachelor's degree.

Mr. Hurst married in 1961, resulting in two children, Debor and Abdullah. Mr. Hurst stated he has a good relationship with his sons, but has limited contacted with Debor, as he is a retired U. S. Army Sergeant currently working in Iraq as a military contractor. His son Abdullah currently lives in Naperville and maintains regular contact with Mr. Hurst. Abdullah reported that, under the circumstances, he has a great relationship with his father. He stated he always enjoyed the long talks they have had by telephone or on visits. He stated his father always made sure Abdullah was staying on the right path. Mr. Hurst's wife stated during the interview that Mr. Hurst is a quality man, and she was often asked why she stayed with him throughout the years. She responded that she asked God "If this is what you want me to do, give me the strength to do it." She also stated she has enjoyed being a good wife to Mr. Hurst. Additionally, she stated that, when she has been out in the community, former inmates would approach her to ask how Mr. Hurst was doing, and they always would tell her he was a positive influence and helpful during their incarceration.

Mr. Hurst's overall institutional adjustment has been positive. He has spent his time in Joliet, Stateville, Pontiac, Menard, and now Dixon. He has received numerous tickets throughout his incarceration, with the last ticket in 2017. No violent tickets are indicated, and most of the tickets were for not following the rules or Possession of Contraband. He reported he was placed in segregation twice in the past, for Intimidation and for refusing to allow a female officer to pat him down. He stated both times were less than 30 days total. He stated he has received tickets because the guards treat you different, with some allowing food in the cell while others don't. He stated some of the guards don't like Muslims and are prejudiced. He reported he has never been a member of any gangs, and that he attended religious services every Friday, when it was offered.

Mr. Hurst is currently unassigned, but he has spent most of his time in the past working with leisure time services. He stated he would help organize all activities in the gym and coach various sports, but mainly basketball. He also held custodial jobs.

Mr. Hurst stated he has enjoyed working with other inmates by mentoring them on avoiding gang activities, being respectful to staff, and working with their religious beliefs. He stated he considers this God's work, as he teaches them "that the fact they are in prison [means] they lost God's grace." Mr. Hurst also spends time proof-reading and editing books for various



authors, usually arranged by his wife. Included in the petition are numerous letters of support from past inmates, prison staff, and prison ministries volunteers.

Mr. Hurst is currently being held at the Dixon Medical Unit, based on his age and past health problems. He suffered from a stroke in 2008, which caused limited paralysis in the right side. He stated he has limited movement of his right hand and arm, and that he walks with a limp. He reported he also had two previous surgeries on his prostate, and his last test indicated everything was normal. Mr. Hurst also suffers from high blood pressure and reports no mental health issues. DOC Staff confirmed Mr. Hurst's summary of his health status.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Hurst has a very comprehensive parole plan. He would live with his wife in Chicago and enjoy daily support from his son Abdullah. In addition, Mr. Hurst's paralegal, Mr. Berry, has offered to help in case management of services at the St. Leonard's House and Inner-City Muslim Action Network ("IMAN"). Although Mr. Hurst will not be residing at St. Leonard's House, he has been offered the opportunity to participate in the programing. Joni Stahlman, Chief Program Director, was contacted, and she stated that Mr. Hurst would be welcomed to the St. Leonard's family and could avail himself of any of the programs offered. IMAN has also accepted Mr. Hurst to participate in any programs offered; this was verified by a letter from the Executive Director, Rami Nashashibi.

The wide range of programs being offered from St. Leonard's House and IMAN to Mr. Hurst would allow him to make a good transition to the community. The services offered include case management, support services, behavior assessment, individual and group counseling, education, and employment services. IMAN has licensed counselors who will meet with Mr. Hurst upon his release to complete an overall assessment of his needs and to establish a plan for future services, which would include both agencies. Ms. Stahlman stated Mr. Hurst will be able to interact immediately with other released long-term prisoners to help with adjustment.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

On February 2021, the Cook County State's Attorney's Office submitted a letter stating they do not oppose the granting of parole for Mr. Hurst. The letter noted that the victim's family strongly objects to granting parole.

Numerous additional letters of protest are on file and continue to be received, including consistent opposition from the Illinois Fraternal Order of Police.



DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton asked if Mr. Hurst had suffered a stroke; it was confirmed that Mr. Hurst had suffered a stroke.

Mr. Berry stated that Mr. Hurst doesn't have prostate cancer, but that he does have an enlarged prostate and needs to have a wheelchair, if he needs to go long distance.

Ms. Crigler noted that she had interviewed Mr. Hurst before and stated that she found him to be a kind and intelligent man. She felt that he had served his time and showed remorse. She stated that she had stopped supporting him, because she was appalled at how one of his sons reached out to a former Member, but now realizes that Mr. Hurst didn't know this had happened. She will continue to support his release.

Ms. Martinez stated that she previously presented Mr. Hurst's case. She stated that she did not support him for various reasons, but believes he was much more forthcoming this time and has a good parole plan now. She noted that she was prepared to look at the time between the crime and now.

Mr. Shelton stated that he didn't support parole for Mr. Hurst in the past. Mr. Shelton also noted that he, too, did not associate Mr. Hurst's son's behavior in reaching out to the former Member with the decision to grant or deny Mr. Hurst's request for parole. Mr. Shelton recalled that Mr. Hurst was very angry and was sending letters to the Board Members, but that doesn't seem to be the case anymore. Mr. Hurst's health is failing, and continued incarceration seems to be pointless now.

Ms. Crigler states that she didn't take his letters as anger but passion. His letters talked about Black matters and she didn't take it personally, as a Black woman.

Mr. Berry stated that Howard Saffold was present at the hearing, noting that Mr. Saffold was himself a former police officer and formerly incarcerated. Mr. Berry stated that he doesn't take every case to present to the Board; he only takes those where he wouldn't mind having the person living next to him, as is the case with Mr. Hurst. Mr. Berry stated he sat down and asked lots of questions with the State's Attorney's Office about not opposing parole. He stated that it was not a political decision. Mr. Berry stated he will be actively involved to make sure Mr. Hurst gets whatever he needs. Mr. Berry again recognized Mr. Saffold and stated that he is a retired police officer, who was on the force at the time of the offenses and can speak to the culture at that time

Mr. Saffold greeted the Board and stated that it is a honor to see if we can make peace in the community. He stated that Mr. Hurst has been so consistent in terms of becoming a man of



God. He stated that, at the time the incident occurred, it was a trying time for police. He said Mr. Hurst's voice is a representation of God's people. Mr. Saffold noted that we are in a spiritual situation in the city and this State; young people are feeling alienated, and we need to bring people back in a better state than when they left. Mr. Saffold stated that people want to trust the police but don't feel they will help them. He stated that this body is helping and that he was grateful to hear that people are changing their minds.

Chicago FOP President John Catanzara spoke in opposition to parole. He stated that this incident occurred a year before he was even born. He stated he listens to conversations of the Board, as to where we can have an out instead of upholding the sentence. He said this Board forgets about the other officer that was physically ruined the rest of his life, and Mr. Hurst has lived a good life. President Catanzara further stated that Murder is an unforgivable sin. He stated that Mr. Hurst already received parole, when his sentence was overturned. President Catanzara stated that Officer Stallworth didn't get [parole]. President Catanzara stated that the courts make determinations for a reason, noting that if Mr. Hurst wasn't put to death, it was understood he would die in jail. President Catanzara stated that every time one of these police killers is paroled, the Board crushes the hearts of the members of the police force. He will keep coming here to stand against parole, because he has heard about the previous case and about the age of 17 being an issue. President Catanzara argued that being 17 years old is not an excuse for someone to be released, and that 17-year-olds kept the Nazis from taking over the whole world.

Mr. Ruggiero wanted to clarify something on the record. He stated that it was bad time for the police back in the 1960s, but it was also a bad time in 1966 for bus drivers at 4:00 a.m., when the offender decided to rob them. Then, a week later at 1:00 a.m., he robbed another bus driver, even though he didn't show a gun.

Ms. Crigler agreed with Mr. Ruggiero. She stated that, during that time, many people were under assault. She stated that Mr. Hurst has been rehabilitated and will never, ever do anything like this again. She said there must be a balance with remorse and rehabilitation, observing that Mr. Hurst has been in prison for over 50 years. She stated that in 1968, she was put on a bus with her child by her husband, because of what was occurring at that time.

President Cantanzara stated that Mr. Hurst had made a comment about life and death, noting that Mr. Hurst stated that he must have been an instrument in God's plan, with regards to his role in Officer Stallworth's death.

Mr. Berry stated that Mr. Hurst served 53 years and 8 months. The man that he was is not the man that he is today. The Illinois Constitution mandates that we restore offenders to useful citizenship. Mr. Berry concluded by arguing that there is no reason that Mr. Hurst should not be released by the Board.



DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (DB—EC). Motion prevails by a vote of 8-4. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Chairman Findley, Mr. James, Mrs. Perkins, and Ms. Wilson. Mr. Fisher, Ms. Martinez, Mr. Ruggiero, and Mr. Shelton dissented.

After a complete review of Mr. Hurst's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Hurst, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Hurst 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—February 25, 2021

Inmate Name: MICHAEL HENDERSON IDOC Number: C81919

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 25, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Michael Henderson C81919.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Michael Henderson C81919, currently housed at Dixon Correctional Center, refused to attend his scheduled interview regarding his parole consideration hearing this year. He has been in continuous custody since his arrest on September 16, 1976. He is 62 years old.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Mr. Henderson is serving a sentence of 60–120 years for the September 15, 1976, Murder of his 87-year-old neighbor, Zelder Wilson, having initially been charged by information with Murder and Rape.

Mr. Henderson gained entry to the victim's apartment by asking for a glass of water. He then announced that he wanted sex, directed the victim to her bedroom, and raped her. After committing this crime, he stabbed and beat his victim to death, leaving her on the floor of her kitchen.

After trying to wash up in the victim's bathroom, he left her apartment with blood still on his hands, wiping the blood on the wall of the first-floor landing. He took a shower, changed clothes, and put his bloody clothing in his sister's laundry bag.

About two hours later, while exiting the apartment, Mr. Henderson told a man who lived in the third-floor apartment that Mr. Henderson had seen a man run out of the victim's apartment, and he asked this neighbor to check on the victim. The man's subsequent discovery of the victim's body was the start of a Murder investigation.



Mr. Henderson, who had been the subject of prior arrests, was questioned by police and immediately became a suspect. Within a short time, Henderson was under arrest and making admissions.

During pre-trial proceedings, a psychologist for the defense and a psychiatrist for the State revealed that Mr. Henderson was mentally retarded, statements which were backed up by periodic I.Q. testing reports acquired from the Chicago Public Schools. Notwithstanding those issues, Mr. Henderson was declared competent to stand trial.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Henderson has been diagnosed with schizophrenia, has a history of dementia, and was housed in a Psychiatric Unit at the time of this review. His most recent report refers to his "complete disregard for rules and authority." He has participated in no programming and may simply be incapable of doing so.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Henderson has presented no parole plan.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

The Cook County State's Attorney letter of opposition argues, as in the past, that Mr. Henderson likely will not conform to reasonable conditions of parole, largely on the basis of a troublesome institutional discipline history; this is an argument that continues to find unanimous agreement from this Board. It also argues that a parole release would deprecate the seriousness of the crime.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton states that the only alternative for Mr. Henderson at this point is a transfer to the Department of Human Services. Mr. Shelton noted that he believes Mr. Henderson to be a sexually dangerous person. Mr. Shelton also stated that he doesn't know what can be expected that would be different for Mr. Henderson at the Illinois Department of Corrections, as IDOC doesn't give him any incentive to improve. Mr. Shelton also noted that Mr. Henderson is still acting out sexually, and that he has no parole plans.

Mrs. Perkins noted that the victim was an 87-year-old woman, whereas Mr. Henderson was 18 years old at the time of the offense.



Mr. Shelton stated that he feels sorry for Mr. Henderson, because he is clearly suffering from serious mental illness.

Mrs. Perkins stated that he does not have any help.

Ms. Crigler noted that Mr. Henderson is in the best place for him at this time.

Mr. Shelton stated that it is an issue of behavior, because Mr. Henderson is still acting out sexually and receiving Good Conduct Credit Revocations.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (DS-EW). Motion prevails by a vote of 12-0. Leave.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Henderson's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that parole release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Henderson would not conform to reasonable conditions of parole release, that a grant of parole release would have a substantially adverse effect upon institutional discipline, 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—February 25, 2021

Inmate Name: **DENNIS CARTER** IDOC Number: **A73403**

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 25, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Dennis Carter A73403.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

A parole consideration interview was held on January 5, 2021, with Dennis Carter A73403. Mr. Carter is currently housed at Stateville Correctional Center, where he has resided since 1995. He is currently on A Grade status, has no history of escape, and is designated as maximum security. On July 17, 2020, Governor JB Pritzker commuted Mr. Carter's sentence of Natural Life Without Parole to Natural Life With the Possibility of Parole. This is his first time being presented for parole consideration.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Per the Official Statement of Facts as provided by the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, on June 7, 1988, Mr. Carter and his codefendant, Lavell Pitts, entered the Tiffany Antique Shop at 11400 South Western Avenue, Chicago, Illinois and announced a hold-up. Both offenders had handguns. Mr. Pitts ordered the victim to his knees and held a gun to the victim's head, as Mr. Carter helped Mr. Pitts take \$1,800 United States Currency and jewelry. As they fled the scene, they each fired a shot at the victim. The victim fired one shot in return.

MR. CARTER'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Carter grew up in a violent and crime-ridden community on the West Side of Chicago. He was the fifth of twelve children. Mr. Carter's father worked, but he struggled to put food on the table for all twelve children and had little ability to supervise Mr. Carter and all his siblings. Although Mr. Carter's parents did the best they could, they had difficulty controlling their children.

Without much supervision or structure at home, Mr. Carter began drinking alcohol regularly around the age of 15. He attended Goldblatt Elementary School and Lawrence Middle



School; he then attended John Marshall High School, before dropping out in 11th grade. He went to a vocational school for a year, received a vocational certificate in welding, and took an electronics class. Around the same time, at the age of 18 or 19, Mr. Carter began drinking every day. Aside from one summer job in high school, through the Irving Progress Center's summer jobs program, Mr. Carter was not employed after he finished his education. By this time, like many of his peers who had little supervision and few options, Mr. Carter had fallen in with the local gangs that controlled his neighborhood.

Mr. Carter struggled to remain out of trouble amidst the danger, violence, and pressures that surrounded him in his neighborhood. In Mr. Carter's own words, he became a product of his environment.

Mr. Carter began by stating he was a young, immature individual who was taking drugs and living the life of a young person growing up on the West Side of Chicago in Garfield Park, where drug dealers, gangs, and pimps were his models of how adults behaved. Crime was all he saw and learned.

Mr. Carter explains the Rape charge as being a teenager with the desire to have sex. He and his co-defendant solicited a prostitute, whom they paid to have sex with them in a parked car in a local park. While engaged in the sex act with the prostitute, the police approached, and they were arrested. No weapon was found, and the prostitute claimed that Mr. Carter and his co-defendant tried to rape and rob her. Mr. Carter stated that she was afraid of getting arrested for Prostitution. He admits to all of the crimes he was convicted of, stating that he pled guilty as a part of a global plea deal that included the other two Robbery charges and the Rape.

Mr. Carter described the other Robbery offenses that he committed as consisting of his robbing local small businesses of small amounts of money, with none of the offenses involving a firearm. Mr. Carter noted that no one was hurt, and he was sentenced to 6 years of imprisonment and released after serving 3 years. He also admitted to a 1980 Robbery in Cicero while carrying a gun, but no one was injured. He pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 10 years in prison.

Mr. Carter explains the 1988 Robbery of the jewelry store as follows: he and Mr. Pitts went to the jewelry store on South Western to sell a piece of jewelry to the storeowner. There was an argument between Mr. Pitts and the storeowner and Mr. Pitts threatened the owner with a gun. Mr. Carter took \$1800, jewelry, and a wallet. They exchanged gunshots with the owner while fleeing, but no one was injured.

Mr. Carter declined to plead guilty to this offense and was charged as a habitual offender based on his two prior convictions for Class X offenses. Upon his conviction, the judge imposed a mandatory sentence of Natural Life Without Parole.



PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

1975 – Armed Robbery (two counts) – sentenced to 6 years.
1977 – Armed Robbery and Rape – sentenced to 6 years.
1980 – Armed Robbery – sentenced to 10 years.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Carter has a very good institutional adjustment and has had no disciplinary infractions in over ten years. He is highly respected by both staff and offenders.

Mr. Carter was a Tunnel Crew Worker while at Pontiac, where he worked under the supervision of security staff and maintained sanitary and safety standards of the institution. He has completed Life Skills Group programming and Reformed Institutional Program. He attends weekly Christian services, and states that the faith-based programs are sources of faith and strength for him.

In 1995, he was transferred to Stateville, where he continued to work in the capacity of Tunnel Crew Worker. His excelled in that assignment and was hand-selected by security staff and approved by the Administration to work inside the grounds as a tractor operator, which required a special clearance due to the equipment that he would have access to. Mr. Carter has worked this assignment for the last eight years and has received only positive reports from the staff supervising him. In this assignment he works with security staff and other incarcerated individuals in landscaping, snow removal, machine repair, and other duties as assigned.

Of particular note, Mr. Carter has provided a letter of recommendation acknowledging the hard work and dedication shown during the COVID-19 Pandemic. It states that "Offender Carter has worked tirelessly serving on the front lines of Stateville during the pandemic ensuring the operations of the facility continue." This recommendation is dated September 20, 2020, and signed by Stateville Correctional Center Warden David Gomez.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Carter plans to live with his brother, Allen. He has the support of other family members, including another brother, Gregory, who has also offered a place in his home.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Fisher asked how old Mr. Carter was at the current time; Ms. Crigler stated he is 64 now, and he has served 32 years.



Ms. Martinez asked about the location of Mr. Carter's family. Attorney Jennifer Soble stated that he has a daughter in Mississippi and brothers in Chicago.

Mr. Ruggiero stated that upon doing a file review, he found that there was a 1975 Rape and an Attempted Murder. He described Mr. Carter's history as including a number of Armed Robbery and Unlawful Use of Weapon charges that he received prior to the Natural Life sentence. Mr. Ruggiero noted that, per the file record, on July 19, 1975, Mr. Carter went to the cleaning establishment with a gun. His mother posted bond for him and he again was armed with a gun; he then approached a female, hijacked a car, kidnapped the woman, and raped her. A police chase ensued. Mr. Carter then shot at the police. Mr. Ruggiero states that Mr. Carter wasn't 17 when he did this; he was 30, and he took at 15-year-old with him. Mr. Ruggiero noted that he just wanted to make sure those facts were discussed.

Mrs. Perkins clarified that this was the Rape involving a prostitute in 1975. Mr. Ruggiero confirmed that was the case.

Attorney Soble stated that Mr. Carter received a Natural Life sentence, noting that his codefendant received a short sentence. She noted that, if he were convicted today, he would be ineligible for this sentence. She stated that Mr. Carter had a horrific life; his father was an alcoholic, and he had no supervision and not enough food to eat. She says that he has had a complete turnaround in his life. Mr. Carter has received commendations from Stateville, noting that it is rare that he would receive a written letter of recommendation from IDOC. Mr. Carter has become a valued member of the prison community. He has received only five tickets, all 300–400-level offenses, and has had no tickets since 2010. She also stated that the Cook County State's Attorney's Office did not oppose his release.

The Board discussed the nature of Mr. Carter's release. Chairman Findley made a statement to that, referencing the Morrisette case that the Board heard in the past, and recalling that Mr. Morrisette was released to a lifetime parole term. Chairman Findley noted that Mr. Carter is the second individual to receive a commutation to parole eligibility, but that more will soon come before the Board. Chairman Findley stated that he supports a grant of release in this case. Chief Legal Counsel Jason Sweat clarified that the commutation would mean that Mr. Carter would be on a lifetime term of parole, and that the parole term would only discharge upon an affirmative vote of a majority of the appointment Members of the Board. CLC Sweat further noted that Mr. Carter would, in the event of a violation, be returned to custody and be subject to the traditional parole consideration hearing process.

Mr. Fisher inquired as to whether he received a plea deal. Mr. Ruggiero confirmed that the sentence was the result of a plea deal, and that several Armed Robbery charges were addressed in the global plea deal. Attorney Soble stated that it was a global plea that Mr. Carter took when he was 17 years old for the Rape and a couple of Armed Robbery charges, but that he was finally sentenced to Natural Life Without Parole after his next arrest, in 1980.



Mr. Ruggiero stated Mr. Carter had a mandatory consecutive sentence, but he got a deal on that case and it was half of what the minimum was at the time.

Ms. Crigler stated that he served time for Armed Robbery cases in which no one was physically harmed, and that he has excelled while incarcerated.

Ms. Crigler stated that Mr. Carter has served 33 years for three Armed Robbery convictions in which no one was injured. Ms. Crigler noted that he has demonstrated a good institutional adjustment and has a strong parole plan.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (EC—WD). Motion prevails by a vote of 11–1. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Shelton, Ms. Wilson, and Chairman Findley. Mr. Ruggiero dissented.

After a complete review of Mr. Carter's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Carter, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Carter 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—February 25, 2021

Inmate Name: JOHNNY VEAL IDOC Number: C71613

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 25, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Johnny Veal C71613.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

On November 4, 2020, Johnny Veal C71613 was interviewed via video conference at 11:30 a.m. Mr. Veal is currently incarcerated at Hill Correctional Center, where he has been housed since March 30, 2005. Mr. Veal is a 68-year-old male, born on November 21, 1952. On January 31, 1972, Mr. Veal was sentenced to 100–199 years each for the July 17, 1970, Murders of Chicago Police Sergeant James Severin and Chicago Police Officer Anthony Rizzato. Mr. Veal has been incarcerated for nearly 51 years. He has never received a favorable vote.

Mr. Veal stated he is doing fair in light of the pandemic, when asked about his health. He stated he suffers from sarcoidosis, respiratory problems, and hypertension. He currently takes medication to help manage his ailments. His projected release date is May 25, 2071.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On July 17, 1970, Chicago Police Sergeant James Severin and Chicago Police Officer Anthony Rizzato were assigned to the Cabrini Green complex. It was the goal of these two police officers to instill and maintain goodwill among the residents of this complex, and thus attempt to decrease the crime rate and violence in the area. These officers volunteered for the "walk and talk" community outreach program, which was created to promote a better relationship between the Chicago Police Department and residents of various communities.

At approximately 7:00 p.m., near the 1150–1160 North Sedgwick and 1117–1119 North Cleveland buildings, the officers were on duty when a citizen approached them and complained that someone was firing a rifle from one of the high-rise buildings. Adjacent to the housing project was a baseball field, and, as the two officers were crossing the field to investigate the complaint, gunfire rang out from the Cabrini Green high-rise building at 1150 North Sedgwick.



Sergeant Severin and Officer Rizzato were each shot and killed by the gunman in the high-rise. The gunman continued to fire shots as other police officers responded to the scene and became targets as well.

Sergeant Severin and Officer Rizzato were transported by squad car to Henrotin Hospital, where they were both pronounced dead on arrival. Dr. Jerry Kearns, the coroner's pathologist, performed autopsies on the bodies of both officers on July 18, 1970. The cause of death of Sergeant Severin was a bullet wound of the liver, the path of which was reported to be downward. The cause of death of Officer Rizzato was a bullet wound of the heart, of which the path was also determined to be downward.

Dozens of police officers were assigned to the investigation, and they questioned the tenants of each apartment. Investigating officers gradually developed information that there were several gang members who had openly bragged that they would kill the two officers from the community relations program.

After the shooting, co-defendant George Knights told an individual by the name of Jerry Davis that "I shot the f*** out of those police." Mr. Knights then held out his hand for Mr. Davis to "give him five." According to trial evidence, Mr. Knights was bragging the evening of the shooting and stated "I told you I was going to get two of those white motherf***ers." Mr. Veal told witness William Dyson, a rival gang member, approximately an hour-and-a-half after the assassination that Mr. Dyson was lucky, because Mr. Veal had his scope on Mr. Dyson, but Mr. Dyson left. Mr. Veal then told Mr. Dyson "See how the Stones do it; let's see if you all can get three of them," in effect challenging a rival gang to shoot three police officers.

According to the investigation, Mr. Veal's gang, the Black P Stones, had planned the execution for several days; Mr. Veal was heard asking fellow gang members for some .30/.30s (a type of ammunition). Mr. Veal obtained a rifle from a fellow gang member, Jake Davis. Mr. Veal later showed fellow gang members the location where the sniper attack would occur – an abandoned apartment (#603) located at 1150 North Sedgwick. Mr. Veal told them that "Here's where we're going to start to ice the police from."

Mr. Veal took a .30/.30 Winchester rifle into the building at 1150 North Sedgwick. On July 17, 1970, Mr. Veal and Mr. Knights armed themselves with .30/.30 caliber rifles, one a Winchester and the other a Savage, and several boxes of ammunition. Later, Mr. Veal and fellow gang members went to apartment 603, where they shot and murdered Sergeant Severin and Officer Rizzato.

The night before the shooting, Mr. Knights purchased two boxes of ammunition from J.W. Millikans, a sporting goods store in Hammond, Indiana. The ammunition was recovered in a bag with the two rifles, within a garbage catch in an incinerator chute in the building from where the shots were fired. Mr. Knights's fingerprints were found on a box of the ammunition. One of the rifles, the Winchester .30/.30, was identified as Mr. Veal's, while the other rifle, the



Savage .30/.30, was shown by ballistics to have been the Murder weapon and belonged to Mr. Knights. After the shooting, Mr. Veal bragged to rival gang member about the shootings and also told other gang members, including rival member Mr. Dyson, when asked who shot the police, "We did." A witness heard Mr. Veal say after the shootings, "Us Stones did it, the Deuces didn't do it; I shot the pigs."

On January 31, 1972, the jury found both Mr. Veal and Mr. Knights guilty of the Firstdegree Murders of Sergeant Severin and Officer Rizzato. Mr. Veal and Mr. Knights were sentenced to 100–199 years for each Murder, and the sentences would run concurrently.

Mr. Veal's sentences were affirmed on direct appeal in 1978. The Illinois Supreme Court denied leave to appeal. Mr. Veal then filed a petition for writ of certiorari with the Illinois State Supreme Court, which was denied in 1979. In 1980, Mr. Veal filed with the federal district court a petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The federal district court granted habeas relief, because the trial court refused to permit Mr. Veal's alibi witnesses to testify. The 7th Circuit reversed the grant of the writ, because Mr. Veal procedurally defaulted the preclusion, by failing to make an adequate offer of proof regarding the witnesses. The court of appeals then remanded for an evidentiary hearing to determine whether Mr. Veal could show cause for the default and prejudice resulting from the state court error. The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Olga Jurco to conduct the evidentiary hearing and file a report and recommendation. The district court overruled Mr. Veal's objections and adopted the Magistrate's recommendations. Accordingly, Mr. Veal's motion for summary judgment was denied, and summary judgment was granted against Mr. Veal. This decision was affirmed. In 1992, Mr. Veal filed a second writ of habeas corpus petition. After a review of the second petition, the district court dismissed it, because Mr. Veal's conclusory allegations were entirely speculative. In December of 1995, Mr. Veal filed his third writ of habeas corpus petition, which was dismissed for delay under Rule 9, and, alternatively, the court noted that it would deny the petition on its merits.

In April 2014, Mr. Veal filed a petition for executive clemency, which was denied.

In 2016, Mr. Veal filed a *pro se* motion with the circuit clerk requesting what he characterized as a successive post-conviction petition. However, this characterization was incorrect, as he had not previously filed a post-conviction petition. The court denied leave to file. However, in 2018, Mr. Veal filed, through counsel, a post-conviction petition, alleging that his sentence is disproportionate and that it constitutes cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the 8th Amendment. The circuit court denied that request for post-conviction relief.

MR. VEAL'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

During the interview of Mr. Veal, he was respectful and willing to engage. A lot of the interview was spent with attempts by Mr. Veal to relitigate the case, which is not the purpose or duty of this Board. However, it did manage to again raise several questions and issues with this case.



Mr. Veal continues to deny any involvement in the Murders of Sergeant Severino and Officer Rizzato. Mr. Veal stated he was on an adjacent baseball field at the time shots rang out. Additionally, he stated he never knew his co-defendant, Mr. Knights, who was then employed as a 23-year-old janitor for the housing development.

Mr. Veal also stated that apartment 603 faced East and not South (as would have been necessary for the shots to have come from that location). He added that there was no evidence that the rounds recovered match those recovered from the victims.

When asked about the comments he made to William Dyson about the shootings, Mr. Veal replied, "I never made those statements. Dyson was not a friend, so why would I say anything like that to him." Mr. Veal went on to say that he and Mr. Dyson were seeing the same girl around that time and were not on good terms, and that Mr. Dyson was his rival. When asked if it was possible that Mr. Veal had made these or similar statements in order to make himself look more powerful to his fellow gang members, he replied that he did not make those comments.

When asked if he had ever fired a long gun or rifle, he replied "No." When asked if he had ever just held a long gun or rifle, he replied "No." He then stated that he thinks he may have fired a shotgun once.

When asked if he would like to make any statements to bring to the Board he replied, "I have done everything I could do for my rehabilitation. Look at my totality."

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Veal is currently medium security level, A grade, low escape risk. According to his offender overview, Mr. Veal states he is no longer affiliated with the Black P Stone Nation security threat group. Additionally, he states that he is certainly not a leader in the group noted, and that he has grown up and matured. Since his last review in 2017, he has received one disciplinary ticket, on October 6, 2020, for abuse of privileges for use of phone. He is currently unassigned; however, he participates in band and Catholic mass. He is a voluntary teacher's assistant in the Man to Man program, which mentors other inmates. He is also a peer educator.

Mr. Veal remains in contact with his family and friends through visits, phone calls, and letters.

He has earned a GED, multiple Associates degrees, 25 vocational and educational certificates, and is 9 credits short of a bachelor's degree. He has become a certified law clerk/paralegal and has obtained numerous certificates in technology and electronics.

He was selected by Warden Dorethy as one of four inmates to supervise and care for inmates with severe mental illness. Mr. Veal developed a program called Project Sound Off,



where he created a multi-faceted curriculum designed to address concerns of lifers and long-term inmates, who are often overlooked in IDOC programming.

The SPIN Assessment from 2017 shows full assessment risk overall moderate, and full assessment protective as overall high.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Veal appears to have a strong parole plan, with several options available both in-state and out-of-state. He has an opportunity, pending the approval of his interstate compact, to reside with his fiancée in Garden City, Kansas.

He has been offered housing in Waterloo, Iowa, in housing owned by local professors. These professors own high quality affordable housing for those transitioning from prison, and help their tenants connect to re-entry programming.

Mr. Veal also has an opportunity to reside with his son in Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

He has been accepted to parole to IMAN in Chicago, where he would receive housing, counseling, and job training.

He also has employment opportunities, including an offer of part-time employment as a paralegal at his counsel's law firm, which could be performed remotely if he is paroled out-of-state.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Chairman Findley asked for discussion and stated this was a young man who committed a horrible act.

Ms. Crigler states that this offense occurred in Cabrini Green in 1970 and at that time they were all teenagers. She stated that it is alleged that the people who testified were coerced to say these things. She stated that Cabrini Green Legal Clinic was created to give fair representation to these young men. Ms. Crigler stated that these children were afraid that they would be beaten if they didn't tell. She believes many things don't hold up in this case, and that the petition for release was excellent and reads like a novel. She stated that Mr. Veal and Mr. Knights don't know each other. She also stated that there is no physical evidence that these shots would have come from their direction. Ms. Crigler observed that an officer stated during the protest hearing that he had to lean against the wall, because the shots were coming from all over. In Ms. Crigler's opinion, with the way Mr. Veal shot, it couldn't have went the way it was stated.



Ms. Crigler then noted that, even if he did plan this, he was arrested on accountability. Ms. Crigler concluded by stating that he has had an excellent institutional adjustment.

Ms. Martinez stated that she has done more reading about offenders under 21, noting that Mr. Veal was 17 at the time of this crime. She remembers when this crime happened. She stated that in the *Miller* case there were facts the courts should look at; *Miller* discussed what happened when a youth is incarcerated. Mr. Veal has used his time to become educated, and he has shown that he has become rehabilitated. He has excellent parole plans. She stated that Mr. Veal has family support and many factors going for him. She noted that she had voted against release in the past, but that she is ready to vote in favor based on his adjustment.

Attorney Sara Garber stated her appreciation for the opportunity to come before the Board. She acknowledged that the crime is horrendous, and the grief is immeasurable. She stated that she believed the Board is recognizing that people are better than the worst thing they have ever done. Ms. Garber noted that the crime occurred when Mr. Veal was 17 years old, and that there has been a change in how society views youth, as Ms. Martinez noted. Attorney Garber noted that experience with this case and the court records indicates that Mr. Veal was not the shooter. He has done incredible work towards rehabilitation. He has taken advantage of all of the programs available. Mr. Veal became a gang mentor as a youth. However, he took music and education to change his life and ignite a spark; he now mentors other individuals.

Attorney Garber also noted that Mr. Veal is respected by staff of the Illinois Department of Corrections. Warden Dorethy wrote a letter stating how Mr. Veal helped to mentor a mental patient to prepare him for society. He joined Aimed Higher program and assisted with COVID protocols during the pandemic. Regarding remorse, Attorney Garber stated that she has tried to look into this case like never before. She believes that Mr. Veal has worked to better himself and choose a life of divine faith. She finds his determination remarkable. Attorney Garber remarked that a previously paroled individual, Robert "RJ" Jones, had passed away suddenly the day prior to Mr. Veal's hearing, which she argued shows the Board can't wait to do the right thing. Attorney Garber concluded by asking that Mr. Veal be paroled.

Mr. Veal's granddaughter, Lawanda Starks, spoke in favor of release. She stated that Mr. Veal's daughter was her mother, and that her mother is now deceased. She stated that her grandfather is all that she has left. He has been the only father she has had since she lost her father at two years old. She admires his compassion. She stated that her family kept her knowledgeable about his freedom. She stated that, as a child, she remembers wanting to be sitting here fighting for her grandfather's freedom. She stated that he has impacted many lives and received degrees. She acknowledged that her mom never was able to hold his hand and take a walk in the park with him. She stated that hearing his voice motivates her in so many ways, and he is the reason she has graduated high school. She stated she is looking to go to school for a bachelor's as a lead teacher, and that he has encouraged her to never give up. She stated that she has since losing her mother. She believes that he deserves to be free and deserves a chance.



Mr. Brink asked Attorney Garber to speak to a recent infraction ticket Mr. Veal received. Attorney Garber stated that she was aware of the ticket. She stated that Mr. Veal is a PREA (Prison Rape Elimination Act) mentor, and a mentee reported that he had been raped. Mr. Veal told staff about the attack, and the offender fought Mr. Veal.

Timothy Kizorek, Sgt. Severin's nephew, spoke in opposition to release. He stated that his uncle was a good man and giving to others. Sgt. Severin was a dedicated policeman and believed he could bring a positive impact to the community. Mr. Kizorek remembered his uncle saying how much he loved working with the kids one week, and then he was brutally murdered on the same field the following week. The family stands by their protest and vehemently opposes release, noting that a civilized society stands by their law enforcement.

Ms. Jean Severin-Cable was recognized. She stated that she is a niece of Sgt. Severin. She spoke with the wife of Officer Rizzato, who is in ill health and couldn't be at this hearing. Ms. Severin-Cable thanked the Board, as they have been a part of her life since the 1980s. She stated that everyone in the room thanks the Board for what they do. She stated that she lives in Florida and still she shows up after nine hours of travel. She wants it to be known that [her family] show[s] up. She stated that Mr. Veal previously relied on his appeals, and that, when he had his best attempt with fresh information, he failed. She read a statement from Judge Wexler. Ms. Severin-Cable further stated that [former Chicago Police Department Superintendent] Eddie Johnson showed up to testify about three or four years ago, and he stated how Mr. Veal tried to burn his brother. Mr. Veal was not an innocent child; he was almost 18. She stated that she is a scientist, and it is easy to look back and change what was presented. The information was on a drawing with arrows and hand drawing. The crime was so heinous that the judge gave a 100–150-year sentence. She wants the Board to ignore the political swings. He could have had the death penalty. The victim's family is suffering, and Mrs. Rizzato will not last much longer. Ms.

Ms. Crigler stated to the family and officers in the room that her family member was a Sergeant in Cabrini Green as well. Her aunt is in her 90s and said her husband was proud to work in that community also. Ms. Crigler stated that their uncle should be remembered for his legacy and not his Murder.

Mr. Shelton noted that a case isn't to be retried every time the Board convenes. He is not sure how he will vote, although Mr. Veal is doing wonderful things. Mr. Shelton stated that he has voted to release an offender who murdered an officer previously. He stated that he realizes that the case was heard, and the judge could have released Mr. Veal for not being guilty. Mr. Shelton says he will go with the jury, who had the evidence.

Mr. Fisher stated that this is one of the most difficult cases he has reviewed and prepared. Mr. Veal does have the best petition he has ever read. Mr. Fisher stated that going to prison probably saved Mr. Veal's life. The life he was living wouldn't allow him to live very long. Mr.



Veal flourished in prison. His stories have never changed. However, Mr. Fisher indicated that he is not able to support parole, because it would depreciate the seriousness of the offense.

Ms. Daniels stated that she spoke with Mr. Veal's attorney and discussed where accountability has been discussed with members in other cases of parole. She stated that this would help where the members wish to focus more on the crime versus his willingness to be accountable and change. She asked that Attorney Garber would highlight cases where the accountability was in question and the individual was released. Attorney Garber stated that Mr. Veal doesn't take responsibility, because he maintains that he didn't shoot the officers. She also noted that she personally believes he didn't do it. Attorney Garber then listed a group of offenders who have been convicted, but maintained innocence, and who have been paroled by this Board.

Chairman Findley stated that the Board is reminded that every case is unique and won't necessarily have the same result.

Mr. Dunn stated that this was a terrible crime. He stated that, at 17, Mr. Veal was making poor decisions and under undue peer pressure. Mr. Dunn stated that Mr. Veal has excellent parole plans, and that he felts Mr. Veal has spent over 50 years and has done all he can do to rectify the situation.

Chairman Findley stated that he could never understand what it was like to be an officer without a vest walking through Cabrini Green during the era of the case.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (PF—DS). Motion does not prevail by a vote of 4–8. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Fisher, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton and Chairman Findley. Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, and Ms. Wilson voted in favor of parole. Parole is therefore granted, as a matter of State law, as Mr. Veal received votes in favor of release from a majority of the appointed Members of the Board.

After a complete review of Mr. Veal's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Veal, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Veal 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—February 26, 2021

Inmate Name: VIRGIL ROBINSON IDOC Number: C90056

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 26, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Virgil Robinson C90056.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

On November 6, 2020, Mr. Robinson was interviewed via video conference from the Lawrence Correctional Center. Present for the interview was Carolyn Klaraquist, *pro bono* attorney. Mr. Robinson was cooperative throughout the interview, but only gave short answers to the questions. He did appear to become frustrated with some of the questions. His attorney was helpful in attempting to get Mr. Robinson to answer some questions in detail. Prisoner Review Board Member Daniel Brink was also present.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On August 10, 1976, Mr. Robinson and his co-offender, Renee Jones, robbed a cab driver, Tyrone Taylor, while armed with a .25 caliber handgun. Mr. Robinson was arrested at a bar, and the gun and victim's wallet were located at the bar. The victim also identified Mr. Robinson in a line-up.

On September 21, 1977, during a bench trial, the victim, Tyrone Taylor, testified, and the case was continued to September 23, 1977, for cross-examination.

After court, while out on bond, Mr. Robinson borrowed his sister's car and, with Leroy White, drove to Ms. Jones's home to have her call Mr. Taylor's home. Ms. Jones reported to Mr. Robinson she had called the number provided, and she asked for Tyrone Taylor, and the person responded, "which one?" Ms. Jones then provided Mr. Robinson with a stocking. Mr. Robinson told Mr. White that Mr. Taylor was the one who had a beef on him in court, and he wasn't going to the penitentiary for the Robbery.



Mr. Robinson then drove to the area of 77th street and Phillips, looking for Mr. Taylor's home, and found out that Mr. Taylor no longer lived in the area. While driving around, they were stopped by police and questioned as to why they were driving in the area.

Mr. Robinson then searched the phone book and found a Tyrone Taylor name at 77th and Essex, which was nearby. Mr. Robinson then checked the mailboxes and located the name Taylor on a mailbox. He then returned to the car to get the nylon stocking and the handgun from the trunk of the car. Upon returning to the building he was buzzed upstairs.

Steve Taylor, Tyrone's father, had just come home from work. Steve Taylor opened the door to see Mr. Robinson standing there with a gun and nylon stocking on his face. Steve Taylor tried to shut the door, but it was forced open by Mr. Robinson. Steve Taylor was shot once in the upper abdomen, once in the left thigh, and once in the forearm. Steve Taylor was able to give the police details of the incident. He underwent surgery, but was unable to survive.

On September 23rd, Mr. Robinson returned to court and told investigators after his arrest that when Mr. Taylor entered the courtroom, "It was the wrong hit." After an investigation, Mr. Robinson was placed in custody, and a handgun was located in the bedroom where he was hiding. Additionally, Mr. Robinson's palm print matched the prints removed from the door of Steve Taylor's home.

MR. ROBINSON'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Robinson maintains his innocence. He stated the palm print on the victim's door was not his and should have proved his innocence. Attorney Klarquist confirmed that the palm print had been verified as Mr. Robinson's at least three times in the past. Mr. Robinson disagreed with the statements.

PRIOR CRIMINAL HISTORY

Mr. Robinson had an extensive criminal history prior to his arrest for the instant offense. He had 26 prior arrests and used at least eight different aliases. He had convictions for Unlawful Use of Weapon, Possession of Stolen Motor Vehicle, Theft, Damage to Property, and No State ID. Additionally, Mr. Robinson had two Escape attempts prior to his sentence for the Murder of Steve Taylor. Mr. Robinson also received a 4-year sentence for Aggravated Battery while in IDOC. In that incident, Mr. Robinson struck a correctional officer with a mop handle, causing serious injuries.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Robinson is the third of four children to Milton and Ellen Robinson. He was born and raised in the Chicago area. His father passed away in 1990, and his mother passed away in 2018. He has two remaining sisters, who both reside in the Chicago area. He refused to talk about his



family, as he had a disagreement with his sisters and niece about taking money from his mother. The record reflects he has a son who resides in Chicago. Mr. Robinson has never had regular visits from family members throughout his incarceration. He did request that family members not to be contacted for additional information.

Mr. Robinson has had a very poor institutional adjustment. When explaining the information needed for this section, Mr. Robinson put his head down on the table and said, "I done nothing." He stated he refused to be de-humanized and he was not going to "kiss anyone's ass." He did state that he worked in the tailor shop in the past, but he mostly stays in his cell to be safe.

Reviewing the file, it was reported on September 29, 2003, that Mr. Robinson has had 43 staff assaults and 10 inmate assaults. Since that time, he has had 5 additional assaults with either staff or inmates. Since 2014, Mr. Robinson has had 11 tickets, and his last ticket was on October 28, 2019, for Intimidation or Threats to another inmate. As reported previously, Mr. Robinson was sentenced in 1984 to an additional 4 years for Aggravated Battery for a staff assault. He also was involved in a violent assault on another inmate in 2005 and received 1 year in segregation.

A check of Mr. Robinson's record on February 5, 2021, did not reveal any additional discipline reports.

He stated he is in good mental and physical health. According to the record, he suffered from a stroke in 2016 and has also been diagnosed in the past with epilepsy; he also takes seizure medication. A 1985 mental health exam revealed no apparent psychopathy tendencies, but did report anti-social personality.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Robinson stated he should be released because he is innocent of the crime. He stated he would request to go to a halfway house, but "I don't really care." He stated "I'm innocent and that should be enough."

Mr. Robinson's petition indicates he has applied to be accepted to St. Leonard's House Ministries in Chicago.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

The Cook County State's Attorney Office filed a letter dated December 6, 2017, opposing granting parole to Mr. Robinson.



DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Ms. Crigler states that Mr. Robinson is in good health. She says that he had one stroke, but it didn't impair him.

Attorney Klarquist stated that Mr. Robinson didn't want Mr. Brink to talk to his family, but the niece asked that a letter be read. The letter was read. The niece asked that his parole consideration recognize that Mr. Robinson has been incarcerated for over 40 years.

Attorney Klarquist states that the State is not protesting his case or any Cook County cases at this time. She stated that Mr. Robinson didn't anticipate being paroled. She believes he will make himself a better candidate for parole should he not be released today. She will continue to work with him. She believes he can get to the point to be paroled. If not paroled, she is asking that he be given a short set so he can get prepared. He needs to have a spark to know that if he does the work, he can be considered for release.

Mr. Ruggiero noted that Mr. Robinson is still maintaining his innocence. Attorney Klarquist states that he does maintain his innocence, but that should not be the consideration to not be paroled. Mr. Ruggiero agreed that it is not the sole reason Mr. Robinson should not be paroled. Mr. Ruggiero asked if Mr. Robinson is in denial regarding symptoms of mental illness; Attorney Klarquist states she doesn't know. She says that she is working *pro bono*, but a choice was made not to challenge the record by appellate counsel.

Ms. Crigler stated that Mr. Robinson refuses to acknowledge what he did. She suggested that he may need some therapy to help him with his denial and his willingness to talk about the case, because he continues to have issues inside the prison.

Attorney Klarquist stated that she thinks Mr. Robinson needs programming, but with COVID, he is unable to complete programming. He has been in prison for 43 years, so counseling would be difficult. His niece is working with him, and he is frustrated with his family. She stated that she would like to see him out and not die in prison. He is a work in progress.

Ms. Crigler stated that he must *want* to get out. Attorney Klarquist agreed, noting that he has had this mentality for over 40 years and he has been very defensive. She acknowledged that, if he wants to get out, he must do something. She stated that she was willing to keep working with him along with his niece. She appreciated the Board's reviews of this case.

Mrs. Perkins inquired as to his age and whether he had any other family contact. Attorney Klarquist stated he is 70 years old. She stated his family lives out of state and that the niece



keeps in contact with him. She stated that the niece understands that he must help himself. If he doesn't choose to do anything, she can't help him.

Ms. Martinez stated that he needs the ability to build the trust and thanked the attorney for her work. Attorney Klarquist stated that it is very awkward for him; most parolees believe they will not get paroled, but they need to be able to relay their humanity.

Ms. Wilson inquired whether he was married; Attorney Klarquist stated he has a son that he doesn't have contact with. She will talk with his niece and will work with the family.

Chairman Findley noted that Mr. Robinson is handling his conflicts with fighting. Attorney Klarquist stated that she discussed the fighting with him, in that he is in his 60s and is still getting into fights.

Chairman Findley acknowledged that Mr. Robinson has very poor institutional adjustment. Attorney Klarquist stated that she will continue to build a relationship with him in the hopes of improving his situation and chances for parole.

Roll was taken. Immediately following the vote, Ms. Daniels indicated she wished to change her vote, in order to give Mr. Robinson some hope; that change was made without objection.

Motion was made for a 2-year set. Mr. Brink does not believe that one year will give Mr. Robinson the time he needs to work on getting a new result. Attorney Klarquist states that she doesn't want to set him up for failure, but she is saying that she is going to help him, and he is up again in December. She stated that she would like a one year set to demonstrate to Mr. Robinson that he is getting a window of opportunity.

Ms. Crigler thinks that, if given one year to work on rehabilitating himself, he could go to a program and he can still work on himself.



DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (DB—VM). Motion prevails by a vote of 10–2. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Mr. Dunn, Mr. Fisher, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Ruggiero, Mr. Shelton, and Ms. Wilson. Ms. Daniels and Chairman Findley dissented.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Robinson'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. Robinson 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.

Motion for a 2-year set (DB—WD). Motion does not prevail by a vote of 3–9. Members voting in favor of the 2-year set were Mr. Brink, Mr. Dunn, and Mr. Ruggiero. Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Fisher, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Mr. Shelton, Ms. Wilson, and Chairman Findley dissented.

"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—February 26, 2021

Inmate Name: SALIK ABDULLAH IDOC Number: C82430

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 26, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Salik Abdullah C82430.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Salik Abdullah C82430, convicted under the name Theodore Bruce Parsons, parole. He is referenced by both names – Parsons and Abdullah – in this document for historical reasons.

Mr. Abdullah has now served 42 years of the two concurrent 500–1000-year sentences imposed in Champaign County for the Murder of two teenaged boys. The presiding judge, Judge Harold Jenson, ordered that the sentences be served consecutive to a 30-year determinate sentence imposed in Vermillion County for Armed Robbery and Attempted Murder of a gas station attendant, offenses which occurred the night before the Murders of the teenaged boys.

The parole eligibility hearing was conducted remotely from the Board's office via video conference to the Dixon Correctional Center, per the State's pandemic protocols, on Thursday, November 3, 2020, in the presence of his legal counsel, Miriam Sierig and Tiffany Green, who also attended remotely.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

On the evening of Friday, September 23, 1977, Mr. Parsons and two of his associates, Robert Eugene Kirkpatrick and Jerry Arthur Gleckler, were visiting in the area of Mr. Kirkpatrick's hometown, Saybrook, Illinois. Mr. Kirkpatrick showed his two companions a bank, which he stated would be easy to rob. The next morning, in preparation for the bank robbery, Mr. Parsons and Mr. Gleckler burgled the residence of a life-long friend of Mr. Gleckler, removing a number of shotguns. That evening, the three met up at the home of Mr. Gleckler, where Mr. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Parsons sawed off the barrels and the stock of a 20-gauge shotgun; this was one of the shotguns they had taken during the burglary, with which Mr. Parsons remained armed during the upcoming crimes.



Mr. Parsons and Mr. Kirkpatrick then left the trailer, with Mr. Gleckler having passed out, and they purchased a box of 20-gauge shells for the shotgun before driving around Danville looking for an appropriate place to rob. They finally decided on an Arco station just off Route 150, immediately to the west of Danville.

Mr. Kirkpatrick initially entered the station, purchased a pack of cigarettes, and left. When he returned to the car, which was Mr. Parson's automobile, Mr. Parsons took the sawedoff 20-gauge shotgun and walked up to the Arco station. There, at the point of the shotgun, he robbed the attendant, Mr. Curtis Smith, of approximately \$180–200, according to the statement he later gave investigators.

After Mr. Smith had obeyed every order Mr. Parsons gave him and peacefully surrendered the money to Mr. Parsons, Mr. Parsons fired the shotgun point-blank into the neck, shoulder, and head of Mr. Smith. Miraculously, Mr. Smith survived the wound, but was paralyzed for life, suffering the loss of use of the entire left side of his body.

Additional research, with the assistance of staff at the Vermillion County State's Attorney's Office, revealed that the victim, Mr. Smith, suffered a series of strokes during his long-term recovery from his wounds; he further suffered from steadily-declining health until his eventual death, years later. Being a military veteran, most of his long-term care was provided by the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Parsons ultimately pled guilty to Attempt Murder and Armed Robbery in Vermillion County Circuit Court and was sentenced to 30 years under the provisions of the new sentencing act, but his arrest did not occur before he and his co-offenders committed the Murders on the following night, which resulted in his additional indeterminate sentence.

The day after the Robbery and shooting of Mr. Smith, Mr. Parsons drove Mr. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Gleckler to the area of Mahomet, Illinois, where they ate dinner at the Hen House, a restaurant just off Interstate 74. They then drove to the nearby Lake of the Woods liquor store, which they intended to rob. After Mr. Gleckler entered the store and "cased it," the three offenders decided they would steal a car to use in the Armed Robbery, rather than run the risk of having Mr. Parsons's car identified. The offenders waited on the parking lot for the appropriate victim car to arrive.

Just before 9:00 p.m., Mark Harris, who was 19 years of age, drove onto the parking lot in his Plymouth Satellite with a front seat front passenger, Douglas Scott Simmons, who had turned 18 four days earlier. Following the purchase of a six-pack of Stroh's Beer, the two young men drove off.

Having made their choice after seeing Mr. Harris's car, the offenders, with Mr. Parsons still driving, followed the Satellite for approximately a mile and a half down a dark county road, where Mr. Parsons then pulled around in front and forced Mr. Harris's car to the shoulder of the



road. After the Satellite had stopped, Mr. Parsons exited his car with the 20-gauge sawed-off shotgun. Mr. Glecker approached with the 12-gauge over/under.

At the point of these guns, Mr. Parsons and Mr. Gleckler ordered both victims out of the Satellite and across the road. The two victims obeyed and offered no resistance. As the victims stood, facing into a cornfield on the north side of the road, with their backs to Mr. Parsons and Mr. Gleckler, Mr. Parsons fired a 20-gauge blast into the back of each of them. After the victims were down, Mr. Gleckler then fired one round from his 12-gauge into the skull of each victim. Mr. Parsons, having re-loaded, fired additional shots into the victim's heads. As a result, the victims' faces were totally unrecognizable, and the pathologist later testified that each young man had little or no skull or brain tissue left.

Mr. Parsons and Mr. Glecker returned to Mr. Kirkpatrick, who was still seated in Mr. Parson's Ford. The trio took the Satellite and returned to the liquor store to commit the Robbery, only to find that the store had closed. They drove around the area for a while, during which they drank the remainder of the six-pack of Stroh's Beer, which they had taken from the victims' car.

The following day, Mr. Glecker drove the Satellite to a small town in Indiana, approximately 10 miles beyond the Illinois State Line and there pushed the Satellite into a ravine. It was later recovered by police.

During the late hours of Tuesday, September 27, 1977, Danville police officers, acting on information and a description supplied by the Danville gas station victim, and also acting on information received from other sources, arrested Mr. Parsons. Mr. Parsons gave a statement admitting the attack on Mr. Smith at the gas station and admitting involvement in the Murders of Mr. Harris and Mr. Simmons in Mahomet, but blaming the actual shootings on Mr. Kirkpatrick and Mr. Gleckler.

Acting upon the information obtained from Mr. Parsons, the police then arrested Mr. Gleckler and Mr. Kirkpatrick, who separately gave statements implicating Mr. Gleckler and Mr. Parsons as the shooters.

Each of the offenders was tried separately. Since the People were seeking the Death Penalty, the jury also returned a verdict finding beyond a reasonable doubt that, in fact, Mr. Parsons himself had intended the deaths of both men. At the Death Penalty stage the jury was unable to agree on the Death Penalty.

In imposing the lengthy indeterminate sentence that he did, Judge Jenson addressed specific remarks that he addressed to the Prisoner Review Board, that, when called upon to consider the release of Mr. Parsons, the Board should read the Report of Proceedings and transcript prepared of the trial, stating, "Anyone who reads the record of this trial, perhaps, would be moved to say, not now – not ever."



MR. ABDULLAH'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Abdullah admits to the Board that he shot each of the victims as described herein and takes responsibility for those crimes.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Over the course of these many years, Mr. Abdullah participated in numerous courses of training and study. The Department of Corrections cites Department-sponsored certificates in Horticulture, Electronics, Computer Technology, Food Service, Psychology and Political Science. He completed an Anger Management program in 2001 and Life Skills Group in 2008. He received a Certificate of Appreciation from Sauk Valley Community College in 1996 for his participation as a Volunteer G.E.D. Tutor.

While incarcerated, Mr. Parsons became a Muslim and changed his name to Salik Abdullah. He is reported to have received certificates from the American Bible Academy and to have been presented with the option to become the Imam at the Mother Mosque of America in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. He is known to have led Muslim services for incarcerated individuals while housed at Pinckneyville Correctional Center.

The record reflects a steadily-decreasing number of Institutional Discipline Reports, beginning in 1978 and ending in 2012, for a total of 38 tickets. Of those, six could be considered violent or assaultive, as follows:

- (10) Disobeying a Direct Order
- (1) Assault on staff [throwing a blister pack of meds, striking an officer]
- (6) Violations of Rules
- (3) Fighting
- (7) Unauthorized property or Contraband
- (16) Other minor infractions

Mr. Abdullah has a number of health problems related to a diagnosis of Ankylosing Spondylitis, a chronic inflammatory disease of the axial skeleton with variable involvement of peripheral joints and non-articular structures. He has for years had significant involvement of the eyes and his petition describes him as "legally blind." He recently underwent surgical replacement of both shoulders, undoubtedly related to this diagnosis.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Abdullah has been accepted into the program at St. Leonard's Ministries and has the continuing support of a family member. He has previously advised the Board that he was eligible to collect disability due to the aforementioned diagnosis. This has not been confirmed by the Board.



Over the years, Mr. Abdullah has enjoyed the support of several St. Francis Catholic workers in writing (2004, 2007, 2010), including offers of housing.

OPPOSITION TO PAROLE RELEASE

There have also been expressions of strong opposition from the family members of both Murder victims, as well as neighbors and other members of the Murder victims' community.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Shelton stated that Mr. Abdullah's record goes back and forth with the name. When Mr. Abdullah was asked about his name change, he said it was a spiritual experience. When asked how he became spiritual, Abdullah said had a mystic experience in 1979. He didn't pen down an actual date of the change. Mr. Shelton pointed out that this explanation does not comport with the disciplinary history, however Mr. Abdullah's response to a challenge on that discrepancy was not entirely unreasonable. Mr. Abdullah doesn't explain the crimes with consistency. Mr. Shelton stated that Mr. Abdullah says he couldn't say no to people and the codefendant was older than him and he couldn't say no to him, as an explanation of how he became involved in the events.

Mr. Shelton states that gratuitous inconsistencies included Mr. Abdullah's 2007 letter to the Chairman, stating that he was a college graduate from 1969 of Texas College in Tyler, Texas – a historically black college supported by the United Negro College Fund.. However, it doesn't meet with his previous statements that he only had a high school diploma or a GED. Mr. Shelton states that he has doubts that he had accomplished those things at that time.

Chairman Findley asked about prior votes. Attorney Sierig stated that Mr. Abdullah had seven votes in favor of release in the past.

Mr. Shelton stated that Mr. Abdullah was one vote shy of getting out last year. Mr. Shelton also stated that Mr. Abdullah has support letters and the support of his family and clergy.

Chairman Findley asked Mr. Shelton to clarify Mr. Abdullah's mystical experience. Mr. Shelton made a more specific reference to Mr. Abdullah's account of an experience he had while alone in his cell in 1979 being the beginning of his interest in religion.

Mr. Shelton stated that what he knows is that in 2004, Mr. Abdullah was listed as Theodore Parsons on the file documents, and then his name changed in 2007.



Ms. Martinez stated that Mr. Abdullah changed his name to Salik Abdullah in 1992. She says that she interviewed him in 2019. She stated that he said he had a very traumatic experience in Stateville. He says that he asked God to help him and he studied every religion after that. She stated that he spent many years of searching and even studied Arabic and Buddhism for 8 years.

Mr. Shelton says that Mr. Abdullah has a diagnosis of skeletal disease and arthritis. He states that he had both shoulders replaced was in bandages. Mr. Shelton stated that this disease could affect the bowels and eyes. Mr. Abdullah has been described as legally blind, so the possibility of him going out running the streets is not a real issue at all. Mr. Shelton stated that the paperwork from the Department shows that Mr. Abdullah has transformed. He states that there is a parole plan to St Leonard's House.

Attorney Sierig stated that he also has his sister in California, and she has been in close contact with him.

Mr. Ruggiero wanted to know when this transformation for Mr. Abdullah occurred. Mr. Shelton stated that the issue was raised in 2013. According to the petition, the transformation began before he ever came into the Department but there are different dates and different stories.

Ms. Martinez states that she recommended him in 2019. He immediately, because of the reaction of his mother, took responsibility for his crimes; in Stateville, he had a traumatic experience. He received tickets because of a couple of instances, including where he threw a pill in the trash when told he needed to take his medication, and the Correctional Officer wrote him up for assaulting him with a pill. Mr. Abdullah also stated that he was also not allowed to call any of the witnesses. He also refused housing because he was being put into a cell with a white nationalist. He refused to be in the cell in 2012, because he said he was being placed in a cell with a mentally ill person. He tried to avoid fighting but he fought with his cellmate, and he requested a transfer because his religious beliefs indicate he should not be in fights.

Ms. Martinez states that Mr. Abdullah told her he wanted to create an online access to allow inmates to buy a line of products they could buy to send home to his family. She noticed that he had difficulty walking into the room when she interviewed him.

Mr. Ruggiero stated that he didn't believe that Mr. Abdullah received three months of segregation for throwing a pill at an officer. He states he is glad Mr. Abdullah is educating himself. Mr. Ruggiero stated that Mr. Abdullah may be changed, but in reading the law, there are disqualifiers if the parole would deprecate the seriousness of the offenses. Mr. Ruggiero stated that he can't see past what Mr. Abdullah did to the innocent teenage boys when he blew their heads off. Mr. Ruggiero also stated that the teenagers likely prayed to God too; he stated that Mr. Abdullah would have received the Death Penalty if he didn't have a hold-out juror who wanted him to get Natural Life. Mr. Ruggiero stated that he wants Mr. Abdullah to do well, but believes he meets the threshold of the law not to be released.



Mr. Shelton stated that he has listened to Mr. Abdullah's counsel. Mr. Shelton wanted to like Mr. Abdullah for what he has done during his incarceration. However, what he did in this case is what keeps coming back. Mr. Shelton stated he wants to hear from counsel.

Attorney Sierig presented corrections. She touched that at the time of the offense, he was 20 years old. The heinous crime was committed by someone we realize today has the potential to rehabilitate himself. He has had a sincere change to rehabilitate. He is also remorseful. He has had over 40 years incarcerated. He has taken responsibility and never said he didn't do it. She stated that he is deeply reformed. He took responsibility when he called his mom that day. He thinks it was a heinous act and is remorseful and has since devoted his entire time to education as his way to become another person. She stated that he has 400 college credits and learned Arabic, the Quran, and the Bible. His name change means he wants to be a new person. He has done a lot to effectuate that change. He leads prayer and counsels other prisoners. He takes his role very seriously in prison. He also helps other prisoners. Regarding the tickets, she noted that he is a white man of Islamic faith, and it has led to problems when has been put into cells with white nationalists. He doesn't fight, but he wants to distance himself. She stated that he has a solid parole plan. He will go to St. Leonard's House if released. He also has a sister with a good relationship, who is in support of him. She has let them know of the difficult childhood he has had.

Mr. Shelton wanted to know if Mr. Abdullah had ever mentioned the mystical experience. Attorney Sierig stated that yes, he has. She stated that his actions speak louder than what happened to him personally. She says there is no doubt that it occurred. Mr. Shelton stated that he asked that question about this change in 2013, because he wants to make sure Mr. Abdullah is being honest. Ms. Martinez stated that this is out of his terrible experience at Stateville. He says he cried to God, whom he didn't believe in.

Ms. Wilson wanted to know if Mr. Abdullah had received other tickets. Mr. Shelton stated no.

Mr. Brink asked about Mr. Abdullah's health. Attorney Sierig stated that he walks with a cane and he is legally blind. She noted that he won't be running laps and has some pulmonary issues and high blood pressure. Mr. Shelton stated that there is no cure for the disease. He can only have the symptoms treated. Attorney Sierig stated that Mr. Abdullah has a reader to blow up the letters so he can read.

Chairman Findley stated that he is not concerned about the tickets. Attorney Sierig stated that there have been no tickets in ten years.

Chairman Findley states that he doesn't believe Mr. Abdullah will have an issue if released.



Mr. Shelton stated that Mr. Abdullah's record and petition suggest major changes in his behavior, and that he has educated himself. Mr. Shelton noted that he only needed to hear again about the crimes because they were brutal. Mr. Shelton says he has a hard time getting past the crimes, although he doesn't believe he can do more.



DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (DS—JR). Motion does not prevail by a vote of 3–9. Members voting in favor of the motion were Mr. Shelton, Mr. Fisher, and Mr. Ruggiero. Mr. Brink, Ms. Crigler, Ms. Daniels, Mr. Dunn, Mr. James, Ms. Martinez, Mrs. Perkins, Ms. Wilson, and Chairman Findley voted in favor of parole. Parole is therefore granted, as a matter of State law, as Mr. Abdullah received votes in favor of release from a majority of the appointed Members of the Board.

After a complete review of Mr. Abdullah's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Abdullah, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Abdullah 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—February 26, 2021

Inmate Name: EARL ALLEN IDOC Number: C91336

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 26, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Earl Allen C91336.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

Earl Allen C91336 was interviewed on February 11, 2021, at 11:30 am. Present at the interview were Mr. Allen and his attorney, Ashton Hoselton. Mr. Allen is 69 years old and is currently housed at Dixon Correctional Center. He has been incarcerated for 43 years. Mr. Allen is currently suffering from Bipolar disorder, Lupus, Diabetes, and COPD.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Mr. Allen has been in IDOC custody since 1978, for the Murder of Geraldine Hubbard and her sixteen-year-old brother, Mr. Hubbard.

On January 9th, Ms. Hubbard's 16-year-old brother Mr. Hubbard was visiting, at which time Mr. Hubbard and Mr. Allen got into an argument over money. Ms. Hubbard returned home to find Mr. Hubbard crying. He said that Mr. Allen had slapped Mr. Hubbard and accused him of stealing. Ms. Hubbard called the police, who arrived and ordered Mr. Allen to leave the apartment, which he did.

The next day, Mr. Allen returned to the apartment. He went into the bedroom and shot Ms. Hubbard in the head. He then walked over to Mr. Hubbard, who was on the couch, and shot him twice in the head. Mr. Hubbard was killed instantly. Ms. Hubbard initially survived; at the scene, she told officers and several witnesses that "Earl Allen shot me and Willie." Four days later, she died from her wounds.

A witness at trial testified that she saw Mr. Allen standing, loading bullets into a gun, immediately prior to the shooting. Another witness observed Mr. Allen run up to the 16th floor apartment of another girlfriend after the shooting. Police went to that apartment and placed Mr. Allen under arrest.



Mr. Allen was convicted by a jury of the Murders of Ms. Hubbard and Mr. Hubbard. Judge Frank Machala sentenced him to 100–300 years in the penitentiary. Mr. Allen has appealed his case twice: once in 1981, and again in 1991; both appeals have been denied.

MR. ALLEN'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Allen's version of what happened that day is different from the State's Attorney's. Mr. Allen stated that Mr. Hubbard cursed in Mr. Allen's house and he didn't like it, so he slapped Mr. Hubbard. The girlfriend, mom, and brother were all talking low in the bedroom, where Ms. Hubbard's mom had a gun. The gun was left on the bedroom floor with three bullets. Mr. Allen got the gun and bullets; he then shot Ms. Hubbard and her brother, before she or Mr. Hubbard could shoot Mr. Allen, or so he claims to have thought. The gun and bullets were on the bedroom floor left there by Ms. Hubbard.

CRIMINAL HISTORY

According to the States Attorney's Statement of Facts, Mr. Allen has a long history of arrests. He was 24 at the time of the Murders and already had been arrested 39 times. He had several convictions, including two for Battery. He also had a pending Armed Robbery case at the time of these Murders.

Mr. Allen was no stranger to the criminal justice system when he gunned down the Hubbards. Mr. Allen was 24 years old and had already been arrested 39 times. In six of those arrests, he used an alias. In nine of the arrests, he failed to appear in court, and a bench warrant was issued for him. On July 14, 1971, he was convicted of Rheft and was sentenced to 1 year of probation and restitution. On September 15, 1972, he was convicted of Petty Theft and sentenced to 30 days in the House of Corrections. On May 16, 1973, he was convicted of Theft and sentenced to 1 year of probation. On November 19, 1974, he was convicted of Battery and sentenced to 5 days in the House of Corrections. On March 7, 1977, he was convicted of Battery and sentenced to 30 days in Cook County Jail.

INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

The beginning of his incarceration was filled with bad conduct, irrational behavior, and bad choices, with consistent disregard for rules and social order. Mr. Allen has had at least 290 disciplinary tickets.

However, since coming to Dixon and meeting Dr. Doyle, who recognized his disorder and began treatment, Mr. Allen has changed his behavior. He has not received a ticket since July 23, 2019, and is currently on A grade. Mr. Allen is working as the Sanitation Specialist in his housing unit. He has held this position since November 6, 2019. Mr. Allen has earned at least 35



certificates in religion and other disciplines. He does have many completed self-help programs made available to him in the institution. He is currently seeking to continue his religious studies.

Mr. Allen additionally just received another certificate in Leadership. He recently received a medical report that says he is on his medication to treat his bi-polar disorder and other medical issues and is doing quite well. Mr. Allen has had of late a great institutional adjustment. He has completed many assorted certificates and self-help classes. Mr. Allen is currently pursuing higher education in religious studies.

Mr. Allen's first appearance before this Board was in 1986. His last parole hearing was in 2016. Since 2000, he has had 3-year sets. He has never received a vote in favor of parole release, and he is coming off a 3-year set. He has been before the Board 26 times.

Mr. Allen says he has nine children; five sons and four daughters. Mr. Allen says he is in contact with four of his children, as well as his brother. He remains close to his brother Wendell and a daughter who lives in Springfield.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Allen has a strong parole plan. His original parole plan was to live with his brother or daughter. They both agreed to house and care for him. However, he has been accepted at New Beginnings.

New Beginnings will offer Mr. Allen housing, along with a holistic continuum of care, food, clothing, case management and medical services. He will gain skills necessary for a successful reentry into society.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Ruggiero inquired as to the mental health of Mr. Allen and wanted to clarify if the mental issue began in Vietnam. Attorney Ashton Hoselton responded that they absolutely could have. She hasn't been able to get documentation from the VA regarding his illness. She believes that the trauma that led to the mental illness was at the death of his younger brother. She says that after his brother died, Mr. Allen stopped going to school. She stated that lately, education had been really important to him. However, after not having that system, his illness spiraled downward. She said he had never seen a psychiatrist, but has recently since the last *en banc*. She says his last *en banc* was in 2017, and, since then, Mr. Allen has had a tremendous change. She stated that he has been meeting with Dr. Doyle and has had improved disciplinary history while in the Illinois Department of Corrections.



Mrs. Perkins stated that Mr. Allen said when he saw the gun and bullets, he should have walked away, but he didn't have it in his head to walk away. Mr. Ruggiero responded that Mr. Allen should have walked away. Attorney Hoselton stated that Mr. Allen has done a lot of Corrections' programing and is taking responsive courses. He believes he will be successful.

Attorney Hoselton also stated there have been difficulties in communication during COVID. She says he has received many letters of support and has a strong parole plan. She said he would be living at New Beginnings, which is transitional housing.

Ms. Crigler stated that she is familiar with New Beginnings, and that it is a new church, doing progressive work. She says they work mostly with young people.

Ms. Crigler also noted that Mr. Allen had lots of tickets prior to 2017. Attorney Hoselton stated that Mr. Allen has had three tickets since his last *en banc*. She noted that most tickets prior were for refusal to take his medication. She says that Mr. Allen is now on the lowest dose of medications, since having seen the doctor. She stated that the ticket he received in July 2019 was for crossing the dayroom unauthorized, but that this may have been part of his day job.

Mrs. Crigler stated that finding the right prescription is sometimes a lengthy process; however, they have the right medications for him now, and he should be successful. Mrs. Perkins stated that Mr. Allen meeting Dr. Doyle was a good thing, because the doctor started treating Mr. Allen effectively. Attorney Hoselton stated that Dr. Doyle has left Dixon Correctional Center, and Mr. Allen is still being compliant. She says it was a matter of figuring it out to set up for success.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to grant parole (AMP-DS). Motion prevails by a vote of 12-0. Leave.

After a complete review of Mr. Allen's case, and after giving thoughtful discussion and consideration to all factors, the Board decided and voted to grant parole to Mr. Allen, subject to conditions of parole release as set by the Board and by law. The Board hereby finds that Mr. Allen 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—February 26, 2021

Inmate Name: Frank Morgan IDOC Number: C15189

The Illinois Prisoner Review Board met in open *en banc* session at 3000 South Dirksen Parkway, Springfield, Illinois, on February 26, 2021, at the 9:00 a.m. session to discuss and deliberate parole eligibility for Frank Morgan C15189.

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

Recording Secretary: Tracy Buckley.

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW AND FILE

An institutional hearing was conducted on December 9, 2020, for parole consideration for Frank Morgan C15189. He has served 50 years thus far.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

In 1975, Mr. Morgan was convicted of Armed Robbery (10-20 yrs.; concurrently to 70-1186 and 1187); Burglary (5-15 yrs.); Armed Robbery (2 counts) (10-30 Yrs.); Murder (100-199 yrs.); Armed Robbery (4 counts) (20-60 yrs.); Aggravated Battery (3 yrs. Consecutive) in Cook and Livingston Counties. At the time of the offenses, Mr. Morgan was on probation for Armed

Robbery, at which time he went on a crime spree on the South Side of Chicago. Ultimately, after committing a string of Armed Robberies and a Burglary with his co-offender, Walter McCalvin, Mr. Morgan shot and killed Hobart Scott, a patron at the Bamboo Room bar.

On April 11, 1975, at the age of 17, Mr. Morgan and Mr. McCalvin began their spree when they broke into the apartment of Michael Kroll, at 7300 South Shore Drive in Chicago. They entered the empty apartment of Mr. Kroll and began to rummage through the apartment. When Mr. Kroll returned home, Mr. Morgan and Mr. McCalvin, who were armed, confronted Mr. Kroll. They announced a Robbery and stated that they would kill him. They held him at gunpoint, cut his neck with a knife, and took all of his clothing and money. Mr. Knoll was forced at gunpoint into the bathroom, forced to strip, bound and gagged, and left in a bathtub filled with water. The two assailants then left his home.

Proceeding a few blocks north to the Country Club Hotel, at 6930 South Shore Drive in Chicago, the second Robbery occurred. The two entered the hotel by climbing through the second-floor window. They began going to different rooms to commit Burglaries, until their search brought them to apartment of the manager of the hotel and his family. They entered with



guns to find Susan Hamilton, who was there with her children. They threatened Mrs. Hamilton at gunpoint and proceeded to ransack the apartment. Mrs. Hamilton was taken to the bedroom, occupied by her two children, where both Mr. Morgan and the co-offender raped her.

Mr. Don Hamilton was a collector of rifles and shotguns. The co-offender found Mr. Hamilton's rifles and 12-gauge shotgun, loaded them, and waited for Mr. Hamilton to return. When Mr. Hamilton arrived at the apartment, Mr. Morgan and Mr. McCalvin threatened Mr. Hamilton. Mr. Hamilton was struck across the face and forced to turn over his wallet. For more than 45 minutes, the Hamilton family was terrorized.

Later, Mr. McCalvin took Mr. Hamilton down to the lobby to get more money, but they could not get into the safe. Soon, a hotel desk clerk, James Lee, was robbed of \$20. Dr. Itze was hit across the face with the shotgun, fracturing bones in his face and knocking out his teeth; Dr. Itze was also robbed of his money. Two other hotel guests, Gilbert Law and Thomas Baker, entered the lobby and were threatened to turn over their wallets. All of the victims were forced into the Bamboo Lounge, where they were instructed to place their money on the bar and lie on the floor. One patron, Mr. Scott, hesitated in complying with Mr. Morgan and the co-offender's demands. Mr. Morgan shot Mr. Scott in the chest, which resulted in Mr. Scott's death.

Four days later, Mr. Morgan and co-offender McCalvin were arrested. The surviving victims identified both offenders in a line-up. Prints found in the Hamilton apartment and at the Bamboo Room Lounge matched both offenders. After admitting to these crimes, Mr. Morgan and Mr. McCalvin also admitted to 25 prior Burglaries, Armed Robberies, and Sexual Assaults of women on the South Side of Chicago.

Mr. Morgan proceeded to two different jury trials: one for the Armed Robberies, Burglary, Rape, and Murder that occurred at the Country Club Hotel, and one for the Armed Robbery of Mr. Kroll. The first jury found Mr. Morgan guilty of the Murder, Armed Robberies and Burglary at the Country Club Hotel, but not guilty of the Rape of Mrs. Hamilton. On March 18, 1971, Judge Phillip Romiti sentenced Mr. Morgan to 100–199 years for the Murder of Mr. Scott, 15–30 years for the Armed Robberies of Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton, 5–15 years for the Burglary that occurred at the apartment of Mr. and Mrs. Hamilton, and 20–60 years for the four additional Armed Robberies in the hotel; all sentences were to run concurrently.

The second jury found Mr. Morgan guilty of the Armed Robbery of Mr. Kroll. Judge Richard J. Fitzgerald sentenced Mr. Morgan to 10–20 years for the Armed Robbery and imposed the sentence to run consecutively to the sentences from the first trial.

MR. MORGAN'S STATEMENTS AS TO THE OFFENSE

Mr. Morgan stated that his co-offender was paroled over 10 years ago, and he should be given the same opportunity.



INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENT

Mr. Frank Morgan's institutional adjustment has been characterized as poor. During the interview, Mr. Morgan spoke of violations to his due process and strongly communicated that the State is holding him against his rights; Mr. Morgan believes that he is past his "day for day" for the Murder conviction of Mr. Scott.

Mr. Morgan is currently on C grade. If granted parole, he states that he plans to find transitional housing with the assistance of State programs.

PAROLE PLANS

Mr. Morgan has presented no parole plan.

DISCUSSION

Summary of discussion for parole consideration:

Mr. Jones noted that on face value, Mr. Morgan's request to be treated similarly to his cooffender is fair, but there are many factors that differentiate Mr. Morgan from Mr. McCalvin. After examining Mr. McCalvin's file, Mr. McCalvin made significant changes while incarcerated that stand out in comparison to Mr. Morgan's time while incarcerated. In addition, Mr. McCalvin was not the shooter in the Murder that took place during their crime spree back in 1975. Mr. James stated that Mr. Morgan was accused of raping the victim in front of the children. He also beat the hotel manager and only retrieved 20 dollars.

Mr. James also stated that he pulled the case of the codefendant. The case stated that the codefendant never shot a shotgun. They started off with revolvers to rob the place. They had two trials and were found guilty. They were also were unruly and fighting the officer. Mr. James stated that these crimes are horrendous. They killed a man and raped a woman in front of her kids. Mr. James wanted to check to see why the other man was paroled; he wanted to know what the difference in the case was. It was a violent and vicious crime.

Mr. James noted that the Board often talks about age and transformation. Mr. James stated that Mr. Morgan is still angry and wants to sue the Governor. Mr. James related that Mr. Morgan didn't threaten him personally, but believed he was already supposed to be released because he was given a Mandatory Supervised Release form with conditions in error. Because Mr. Morgan had the form, he believed he should be released. Mr. Morgan is angry. However, he is an incredible artist and wants to start a business. His dreams are so important to him. Mr. James stated that when he looked at the partner and reviewed his petition, he saw that there was a transformation.

Mr. James spoke about the hearings from the day before and what the Board has stated about what the court says and what the change has been. Mr. James stated that here there has



been no change. There is no parole plan. He could work with the State to find placement, but the big issue is that if released, Mr. James is not sure if Mr. Morgan would be able to function. He has been incarcerated for 51 years and he hasn't really gone to find help.

Ms. Crigler stated that this is known as the Southshore Murders. She suggests that the Board should refer this case to one of the attorney groups and maybe have Ms. Futorian work with him to see if they could get anything different out of him. She stated she would be afraid for him to be out, because of his anger, and would feel the need to protect society from Mr. Morgan.

Mr. Ruggiero stated that Mr. Morgan has some disciplinary issues.

Mr. James agreed with Mr. Ruggiero and stated that there is a very thick packet from the State's Attorney's Office in opposition; his last disciplinary report was in 2020.

Chairman Findley recognized Assistant Attorney General Agnieska Bugaj as the representative of the Attorney General's Office. AAG Bugaj stated that she has not made a determination as to whether she will be seeking to have Mr. Morgan evaluated as a sexually dangerous person at this time.

DECISION AND RATIONALE

Motion to deny parole (OJ-EKW). Motion prevails by a vote of 12-0. Leave.

After thorough consideration of Mr. Morgan's case, the Board voted to deny parole. The Board feels that parole release at this time would not be in the interest of public safety, as there is a substantial risk that Mr. Morgan would not conform to reasonable conditions of parole release, that a grant of parole release would have a substantially adverse effect upon institutional discipline, 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."