

Complaint Form

New York State Commission on Judicial Conduct

Complaint Form -- Confidential

If you would like to fill in this form online please click <u>here</u>, to use this form, you need a "pdf" program such as Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available as a free download from the Adobe website: http://www.adobe.com. Alternatively you can print this webpage, complete it, and mail it to the Commission office nearest you:

61 Broadway, Suite 1200 ♦ New York, NY 10006

Corning Tower, Suite 2301 ♦ Empire State Plaza ♦ Albany, New York 12223

400 Andrews Street ♦ Rochester, NY 14604

A complaint to the Commission must be in writing and signed. (See New York Judiciary Law Section 44.1.) A complaint does not have to be sworn or notarized. You may submit a complaint by letter or by using this complaint form. If you submit a letter, please include the information requested by this form. Please note that all complaints received by the Commission are scanned and electronic copies are provided to each Commission member; therefore, it is unnecessary to provide more than one copy of any material.

Today's Date: 8/4/3

Your Name: Cheryl L. Kates - Benman Esq

Address: PO BOX 734

Victor, NY 14564

Home Phone: Business Phone: 585-820-38/8

Are you represented by a lawyer? Yes No

Lawyer's Name:

Address:

| Telephone: | |
|---|---------------------|
| Judge's Name: Complaint Information Parole | emond g E Low |
| Details of Complaint | |
| In the space below, please describe the alleged misconduct. Include as much detailed information as possible, such as what happened, where and when; the names of witnesses; who said what to whom, and in what tone of voice; etc. Use additional sheets if necessary. | |
| Official Statements to the Nys Panole Board Per an individual's request Rules governing | |
| Committee on Judicial Ethics allow judge to provide a letter only when an inquire | |
| is received from the Dinsion of Panole. a jude is prohibited from writing an official statement of the Board Of Panole on Panole of the Board of Danole on Panole | ye ont |
| based on sections 100,1; 100,2 (A); 100,2(B) | |
| anticle le section 22 subdivision (a) of Complainant's Signature: Chryl L. Kath Benman 550 | |
| advance private interests; matter of Byrne 47 NY 206 (1979). (cont) | \ |

Judgeo can respond to cen y icura repuest for his or her views. A judge may not initiate communication with those entities in order to convey information (Opinion 974). In the case of Jamie Dunn vs. Doccs as the defendant's attorney I located the Dentencing judge who is sibre retired from the bench. I sent him a synopsis of what Jamie Dunn accomplished while incarcrate Jamie Dunn was dénied parolo and his case was pending on appeal. It was upon information and belief due to the judge's pretirement he was not notified an official steetement request was requested by parole. I then notified pavole head counsel acrence Tracy. of the Board of parole the Judge's current contact information and Judge's current contact information and requested an official statement request we. Lent to the judge beg parolo. The appeals Lent ruled in the appeal, despite being advised the judge did not receive the requess They did not have to recontact him prejudicing the defendant because the judge cannot initiate contact nor Supply the official Statement without Receiving the Request from parde-

individual's request. Rules governing judicial conduct & opinions of the advisory Committee on Judicial Ethics callow judges to provide a Letter only when an inpury is received from the Division of pavole. a judge is prohibited from writing an official statement to the Bound of parole on repuest of a party based on sections 100,1,100,2(A),100,2(B) and 100,2(C) and will be desceptioned under article 6, Section 22, subdivision a 07 the NYS Constitution & Section 44, subdivision / of the Judiciary Law: Judges cannot advance Private interests; matter of Byrne, 47 Nyzd(b) (1919) (1979).Judges can respond to an official request for his or her views. a judge may not initiate communication with those entities in order to convey information (Opinion 97-92). In the case of Jamie Dunn vs. Doccs as the defendant

attorney I located the sentencing judge who is since retired from the bench. I sent him a synopsis of what Jamie Dunn accomplished while incancenated. Jamie Dunn was denied parove and his case was pending on appeal. It was upon information and belief, due to the judge's retirement he was not notified an official statement was requested by parole. I then notified the Head course! Terrence trace of the Board of parole the Judge's current contact information and requested an Official statement Request was sent to the judge by pavole the Appeals unit ruled in the appeals dispite being advised the judge did not receive the request they did not have to recontact him prejudicing the defendant

New York State Unified Court System Office of the Inspector General

Complaint Form

Please complete this form to file a general complaint with the Inspector General's Office. Following the receipt of your complaint, you will be contacted by a member of our staff responsible for investigating your complaint.

| Name: Charles Benman & . Mailing Address: POBOX 734 City: VICTON State: Ny Zip code: 14634 Home Phone: 585-586 Work Phone: 685-820- E-mail: Chery 1040 (Carol. com 3818) Information about the complaint: |
|---|
| Name of subject of complaint: The Appeals Unit, NYSDOCCS Address: 1220 washington Ave Building 2 City: 1418any State: Ny Zip code: 12220 Home Phone No.: 518-473- |
| Is subject of complaint a court employee?: YesNo:No:No: |
| Location of Complaint: Court: |
| Please briefly summarize your complaint: Failure to Send Official Statement reducts to sentencing judges on defendants criminal compatter as repursed by Nys Executive law 259 (i) repusted by sentencing Judge or former defense ettorney's who are now judges or court employees. as just rendered in the case of Judge authorize the New York State Unified Court System's Office of the Inspector General to use my name in investigating this claim. Signature: Note that Date: 8-4-13 |
| Please attach any additional information Office of the Inspector General Office of Court Administration |

Please attach any additional information you may have about the claim and mail or fax this form or copy to: Office of the Inspector General Office of Court Administration 25 Beaver Street New York, New York 10004 Phone No: 646-386-3500 Fax No: 212-514-7158 Cheryl L. Kates-Benman Esq. Attorney at Law PO Box 734 Victor, NY 14564 (585) 820-3818

Governor Cuomo The Capital Albany, NY 12224

NYS Inspector General's Office NYS DOOCCS 1220 Washington Avenue Building 2 Albany, NY 12226

Re: Tina Stanford , Newly Appointed Chairwoman of Parole The Appeals Unit

Re: Kerry Norton v DOCCS Jámic Dunn v DOCCS

UNEQUAL TREATMENT AT THE PAROLE BOARD FOR DEFENDANTS DESPITE NEW CHAIRWOMAN, TINA STANFORD PLEDGING TO THE PRESS VICTIM'S WOULD NOT BE GIVEN FAVORABLE TREATMENT

August 3, 2013

Dear Sirs,

Please investigate the newly appointed chairwoman Tina Stanford at the NYS Board of Parole and the Appeals Unit. It appears these offices are using their governmental authority to afford favorable treatment to crime victims.

The Parole Board does not extend equal treatment to defendants as they do victims. As you know, when a victim comes forth after the fact of the Parole Board hearing, the Board quickly will allow for a victim impact statement. This sometimes results in the defendant's granted hearing being foregone and they rescind parole. Decisions in the courts indicate the victim can come forth after the fact and this constitutes relevant evidence the Board should consider.

Despite there being an equally determined requirement in 259 (i), wherein the Board now SORC due to merger, must solicit the official statement of the defense attorney, DA or sentencing judge, the Parole Board is currently not extending the same treatment they afford victim's to defendants.

In a recent case, it was raised on administrative appeal that the Parole Board did not contact the defense attorney and solicit the official statement required by NYS Executive Law 259 (i). The Board raised the issue they sent a request two weeks after sentencing and the attorney didn't reply as satisfying their requirements.

They Board states because the mail wasn't returned they could assume the attorney received their request, The attorney indicated in the letter he submitted he in fact **did not receive their request** and then he wrote an official statement, This was after the defendant was denied parole. The attorney moved his office and did not maintain business at the address wherein the Board sent the correspondence.

If this were a victim coming forward indicating they wanted to make a victim impact statement, the Board would have allowed the opportunity. If the victim opposed the defendant release, the Board would schedule a rescission hearing and rescind their decision of granting parole.

The equal protection promised by Tina Stanford chairwoman of the Board and victim's advocate is not being upheld by the Appeals Unit, the defendant should also be afforded the same treatment. The defense attorney asserted he never received the mail and this in itself should warrant a de novo is granted for the defendant to be allowed the same courtesy as a victim.

In a second case, the Appeals Unit was notified the sentencing judge in the matter retired and never received the request to write a letter. The judge indicated he would write a letter but the request had to come from parole for ethical considerations. I notified Terrence Tracy(head counsel) this judge wanted to make a statement and that he indicated he would do so if Parole sent him an official request.

This is necessary because judge's cannot respond to personal requests made for assistance to avoid appearing they acted with favoritism or impropriety. A judge was recently disciplined (Judge Nancy Smith) for writing a letter to the parole board without receiving a request from parole.

The Board sent the official request to the court where the sentencing judge previously resided. The judge did not get the request as he is retired. In the appeal decision the Board once again indicated they did not have to re-contact the judge even when he requested they sent a request.

This is an unfair and biased policy wherein the victims of crimes are being given an unfair advantage over defendants in making statements to the Parole Board. In light of the fact, this recently started happening since the appointment of Ms. Stanford, it is reasonable to conclude this is part of the equation. Prior to her appointment, when an official statement request was received, after the fact by a defense attorney a de novo was granted.

Additionally, when notified a judge wished to make a statement, a request was sent and if a letter was received a de novo was granted, This disparate unfair policy cannot continue in that offenders and victims must be afforded the same courtesy under NYS Executive Law 259 (i). There is no provision in the statute indicating there should be favorable treatment granted for one over the other. This is a violation of due process.

Cheryl L. Kates-Benman Esq. Attorney at Law PO Box 734 Victor, NY 14564 (585) 820-3818