



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Public Safety and Security

PAROLE BOARD

12 Mercer Road
Natick, Massachusetts 01760



Maura T. Healey
Governor

Kimberley Driscoll
Lieutenant Governor

Gina K. Kwon
Secretary

Telephone: (508)-650-4500

Facsimile: (508)-650-4598

Angelo Gomez, Jr.
Chair

Lian Hogan
Executive Director

RECORD OF DECISION

IN THE MATTER OF

ALEXANDER GALLETT
W105254

TYPE OF HEARING: Initial Hearing

DATE OF HEARING: December 18, 2025

DATE OF DECISION: March 23, 2026

PARTICIPATING BOARD MEMBERS: Edith J. Alexander,¹ Dr. Charlene Bonner, Sarah B. Coughlin, Angelo Gomez Jr., James Kelcourse, Rafael Ortiz

VOTE: Parole is denied with a review in 1 year from the date of the hearing due to a split decision.²

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On September 24, 2014, following a jury trial in Suffolk County Superior Court, Alexander Gallett was convicted of murder in the first-degree for the death of Richel Nova. He was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole. On that same date, he was sentenced to a concurrent term of 5 to 7 years for armed robbery and a concurrent term of 1 to 3 years for breaking and entering in the nighttime with intent to commit a felony, which was deemed served.

Mr. Gallett became parole eligible following the Supreme Judicial Court's decision in Commonwealth v. Mattis, 493 Mass. 216 (2024), where the court held that sentencing individuals who were ages 18 through 20 at the time of the offense (emerging adults) to life without the possibility of parole is unconstitutional. As a result of the SJC's decision regarding his first-degree murder conviction, Mr. Gallett re-sentenced to life with the possibility of parole after 15 years.

¹ Board Member Alexander was not present for the hearing but reviewed the video recording of the hearing and the entirety of the file prior to vote.

² Three Board Members voted to grant parole, three Board Members vote to deny parole with a review in 2 years, resulting in a split decision.

On December 18, 2025, Mr. Gallett appeared before the Board for an initial hearing. He was represented by Attorney Sara Atalay. The Board's decision fully incorporates by reference the entire video recording of Mr. Gallett's December 18, 2025, hearing.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE: On September 1, 2010, 18-year-old Alexander Gallet participated with his co-defendants in the stabbing death of 58-year-old Richel Nova during the commission of an armed robbery in Boston. On the afternoon of September 1, Mr. Gallett and his co-defendants were heard devising a plan to rob someone. That evening, Mr. Gallett and his co-defendants took a bus to a vacant house in Hyde Park. They called a pizzeria and placed an order for delivery. They also asked if the delivery driver would have change for large bills. Mr. Nova arrived with the order and was escorted up the rear staircase of the vacant house. Five minutes later, Mr. Gallett and his co-defendants left the house with a pizza box and drove away in Mr. Nova's vehicle. The vehicle was later found abandoned in a parking lot. In and around the vehicle, officers recovered a pizza box, empty bleach, and rubbing alcohol bottles. The label on the outside of the pizza box listed the delivery address as that of the vacant house, along with a co-defendant's cell phone number.

Officers responding to the vacant house found Mr. Nova unresponsive. His pant pockets were turned inside out, and he had visible puncture wounds. Mr. Nova did not survive his injuries. Officers discovered significant forensic evidence implicating Mr. Gallett and his co-defendants. Fingerprints and DNA were found at the vacant house, on Mr. Nova's body and car, and on the pizza boxes. Mr. Gallett and his co-defendants also made inculpatory statements when interviewed by police.

APPLICABLE STANDARD: Parole "[p]ermits shall be granted only if the Board is of the opinion, after consideration of a risk and needs assessment, that there is a reasonable probability that, if the prisoner is released with appropriate conditions and community supervision, the prisoner will live and remain at liberty without violating the law and that release is not incompatible with the welfare of society." M.G.L. c. 127, § 130. In making this determination, the Board takes into consideration an inmate's institutional behavior, their participation in available work, educational, and treatment programs during the period of incarceration, and whether risk reduction programs could effectively minimize the inmate's risk of recidivism. M.G.L. c. 127, § 130. The Board also considers all relevant facts, including the nature of the underlying offense, the age of the inmate at the time of the offense, the criminal record, the institutional record, the inmate's testimony at the hearing, and the views of the public as expressed at the hearing and/or in written submissions to the Board.

Where a parole candidate was convicted of first-degree murder for a crime committed when he was ages 18 through 20 years old, the Board considers the "unique aspects" of emerging adulthood that distinguish emerging adult offenders from older offenders. Commonwealth v. Mattis, 493 Mass. 216, 238 (2024). Individuals who were emerging adults at the time of the offense must be afforded a "meaningful opportunity to obtain release based on demonstrated maturity and rehabilitation" and the Board evaluates "the circumstances surrounding the commission of the crime, including the age of the offender, together with all relevant information pertaining to the offender's character and actions during the intervening years since conviction." Id. (citing Diatchenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk Dist., 466 Mass. 655, 674 (2013) (Diatchenko I); Miller v. Alabama, 567 U.S. 460, 471 (2012); Graham v. Florida, 560 U.S. 48, 75 (2010)). Since brain development in emerging adulthood is ongoing, the Board also considers the

following factors when evaluating parole candidates who committed the underlying offenses as an emerging adult: 1) a lack of impulse control in emotionally arousing situations; 2) an increased likelihood to engage in risk taking behaviors in pursuit of reward; 3) increased susceptibility to peer influence which makes emerging adults more likely to engage in risky behavior; and 4) an emerging adult's greater capacity for change. See Mattis, 493 Mass. at 225-229.

DECISION OF THE BOARD: Mr. Gallett appeared before the Board as a result of the Supreme Judicial Court's Mattis decision. Mr. Gallett was the person who stabbed Mr. Nova. Mr. Gallett noted the influence of STGs (Security Threat Groups) on his behavior. The Board reviewed the evaluation of Dr. Herzog. Mr. Gallett is low risk on the LS/CMI risk assessment. The Board notes the characteristics of the emerging adult brain. Mr. Gallett's disassociation from STG has been accepted by the Department of Correction. He has participated in multiple programs. However, due to the nature and circumstances of the underlying offense and Mr. Gallett's role in it, the Board's decision is divided, and Mr. Gallett is eligible for a review hearing in one year. The Board considered testimony in support of parole from two re-entry specialists and a member of the community. The Board considered testimony in opposition to parole from Mr. Nova's son, as well as Suffolk County Assistant District Attorney Montez Haywood. Parole is denied because a majority of the Board did not vote to parole Mr. Gallett, and the Board will conduct a parole hearing in one year from the date of his 2025 hearing.

I certify that this is the decision and reasons of the Massachusetts Parole Board regarding the above-referenced hearing. Pursuant to G.L. c. 127, § 130, I further certify that all voting Board Members have reviewed the applicant's entire criminal record. This signature does not indicate authorship of the decision.


Angelo Gomez Jr., Chair

March 23, 2026
Date