



**Charles D. Baker**  
Governor

**Karyn Polito**  
Lieutenant Governor

**Daniel Bennett**  
Secretary

*The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
*Executive Office of Public Safety and Security*

**PAROLE BOARD**

*12 Mercer Road*  
*Natick, Massachusetts 01760*

*Telephone # (508) 650-4500*

*Facsimile # (508) 650-4599*



**Paul M. Treseler**  
Chairperson

**Michael J. Callahan**  
Executive Director

**DECISION**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**BRUCE WILBORN**  
**AKA BRUCE MOORE**  
**W41085**

**TYPE OF HEARING:** Review Hearing

**DATE OF HEARING:** February 9, 2016

**DATE OF DECISION:** July 20, 2016

**PARTICIPATING BOARD MEMBERS:** Paul M. Treseler, Dr. Charlene Bonner, Tonomey Coleman, Sheila Dupre, Ina Howard-Hogan, Tina Hurley, Lucy Soto-Abbe

**DECISION OF THE BOARD:** After careful consideration of all relevant facts, including the nature of the underlying offense, the age of the inmate at the time of offense, criminal record, institutional record, the inmate's testimony at the hearing, and the views of the public as expressed at the hearing or in written submissions to the Board, we conclude by unanimous vote that the inmate is not a suitable candidate for parole. Parole is denied with a review scheduled in five years from the date of the hearing.

**I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE**

On January 23, 1985, in Hampden Superior Court, Bruce Wilborn pled guilty to the second-degree murder of Stanley Weinstock. A sentence of life in prison with the possibility of parole was imposed on Mr. Wilborn for the murder of Mr. Weinstock.

In October 1983, Mr. Wilborn and (co-defendant) Robert Gonzales were residing in Ludlow with Mr. Weinstock. Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales became very close and decided that Mr. Weinstock was interfering with their relationship. The two men entered into a pact to kill Mr. Weinstock as a way of demonstrating their affection for one another. Based on conversations he had with Mr. Weinstock, Mr. Wilborn also believed that he would be the beneficiary of Mr. Weinstock's estate.

Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales devised a plan to lure Mr. Weinstock to a parking lot, where they intended to murder him. Knowing that Mr. Weinstock would often post advertisements in the newspaper seeking "houseboys," Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales sent Mr. Weinstock a letter from a fictitious man named "Tom." The letter stated Tom's interest in entering into a sexual relationship with Mr. Weinstock. The letter directed Mr. Weinstock to meet "Tom" at a parking lot in Springfield at a specified time on October 23, 1983. When Mr. Weinstock told Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales about the letter, they encouraged him to meet up for the date. On the evening of October 23, Mr. Weinstock went to the designated parking lot to meet "Tom." Between 7:30 p.m. and 8:00 p.m., Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales found Mr. Weinstock in the parking lot and one, or both of them (each man insisted that the other inflicted the stab wounds), stabbed Mr. Weinstock more than 30 times.

After murdering Mr. Weinstock, Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales got rid of some of the evidence in a dumpster behind a restaurant. They then picked up a friend to go drinking and dancing at a local lounge. During the course of the evening, Mr. Wilborn and Mr. Gonzales disposed of additional evidence. They also drove by the parking lot multiple times to see if the police had discovered Mr. Weinstock's body. Mr. Wilborn was subsequently arrested for the murder on October 27, 1983.

## **II. PAROLE HEARING ON FEBRUARY 9, 2016**

Mr. Wilborn, now 53-years-old, appeared before the Parole Board on February 9, 2016, for a review hearing and was represented by Attorney John Rull. Mr. Wilborn's initial appearance before the Board, in November 2001, resulted in the denial of parole. Mr. Wilborn appeared before the Board in November 2006, and he was again denied parole. Pursuant to a settlement agreement in a civil action that Mr. Wilborn brought against the Parole Board, he was given a review hearing on May 28, 2009. He received a positive vote at this hearing and was paroled to Illinois to live with his mother and step-father. In 2010, Mr. Wilborn was returned to custody for violating his parole conditions. He appeared before the Board in 2012 for a review hearing (after the revocation of his parole) and parole was denied.

In Mr. Wilborn's opening statement to the Board, he apologized to the family and friends of Mr. Weinstock. He also expressed shame and remorse for his crime. Mr. Wilborn explained that the murder was a result of greed and manipulation. Throughout the hearing, Mr. Wilborn admitted to, and addressed, his long pattern of manipulative and criminally deceptive behavior. He stressed, however, that he has since changed this way of thinking. Mr. Wilborn also stated how his new thinking, which is devoid of manipulation and deception, would facilitate his ability to abide by the conditions of parole.

During the hearing, the Board expressed concern regarding Mr. Wilborn's continued manipulations and deceptions, including those carried out during the course of his 10 month parole, and asked him to address the events that led to his re-incarceration. Mr. Wilborn admitted to, and elaborated on, his 15 year relationship with an inmate serving a life sentence for first degree murder. He said that his involvement with the inmate began as a friendship and developed into a romantic relationship. Subsequently, he became close with the inmate's family as well. The inmate's father helped Mr. Wilborn navigate and interact with the outside world by helping him with his education, assisting him in getting two books published, and communicating with his mother who resides in Illinois.



After being released on parole, Mr. Wilborn continued to have contact with the inmate and the inmate's family. The Board questioned Mr. Wilborn regarding his involvement in a plot to provide the inmate with an altered computer. Mr. Wilborn indicated that the plan to get a certain computer to the inmate was devised prior to Mr. Wilborn being released on parole. Mr. Wilborn admitted to helping the inmate's father carry out the plan, which involved disguising a computer and giving it to the inmate inside the prison. The computer was equipped with hidden internet capabilities, including satellite mapping technology. It was believed that the computer was potentially going to be used in an escape attempt by the inmate. Mr. Wilborn acknowledged that criminal thinking was behind his involvement in getting the computer to the inmate, but maintains that he had no intention of helping the inmate escape.

Mr. Wilborn discussed why maps were sent to the prison by the inmate's father (prior to Mr. Wilborn's release). Mr. Wilborn claimed that the maps were driving directions for him to use to get to a family member's home in Illinois upon being paroled. Mr. Wilborn said that these maps were part of his itinerary he was going to submit to the Institutional Parole Officer. Mr. Wilborn also discussed a monitored phone conversation between him and the inmate, during which the inmate mentioned getting out of prison and leaving the state. The inmate stated that he thought it was "time to come home," and that he told his father to have an SUV ready because he would be getting his license on his second day out of prison. During the call, there was also discussion of a check that the inmate's father was going to give to Mr. Wilborn. Mr. Wilborn stated that the inmate was working on appealing his case and it was just the inmate's "wishful thinking" about what might happen if the inmate was able to get his case overturned. In addition, Mr. Wilborn said that the check was to cover the cost of the telephone service between him and the inmate. Mr. Wilborn indicated that it was an "unfortunate coincidence" that the discussion of what the inmate would like to do (if he wins his appeal) coincided with prison officials investigating the internet capabilities on the altered computer.

Mr. Wilborn stressed that at the time of his first parole, he had not yet addressed his criminal thinking and his patterns of negative behavior. He admitted that he had deceived the Board in 2009, in order to attain a parole that he was not yet ready for. He also spoke of the 2012 denial of parole, as well as the efforts he took after the denial to change his manipulative behavior and criminal thinking. After addressing a disciplinary infraction he incurred in 2014 for a brief sexual relationship with another inmate (which he self-reported), Mr. Wilborn acknowledged that there were connections between his past relationships, his fears, and his criminal thinking and manipulation. Mr. Wilborn has participated in many programs while incarcerated, including acting as a facilitator in the Alternatives to Violence. Since being returned to custody, Mr. Wilborn has also received mental health counseling and is close to completing his degree.

The Board considered testimony from Hampden County Assistant District Attorney Howard Safford, who spoke in opposition to Mr. Wilborn's parole. Although there were no individuals who gave testimony in support of Mr. Wilborn's parole, it was noted by Attorney Rull that his supporters either resided outside of the Commonwealth or had health limitations that prevented them from attending the hearing.

### III. DECISION

The Board is of the opinion that Mr. Wilborn has not demonstrated a level of rehabilitative progress that would make his release compatible with the welfare of society. The Board believes that a longer period of positive institutional adjustment and programming would be beneficial to Mr. Wilborn's rehabilitation.

The applicable standard used by the Board to assess a candidate for parole is: "Parole Board Members shall only grant a parole permit if they are of the opinion that there is a reasonable probability that, if such offender is released, the offender will live and remain at liberty without violating the law and that release is not incompatible with the welfare of society." 120 C.M.R. 300.04. In forming this opinion, the Board has taken into consideration Mr. Wilborn's institutional behavior, as well as his participation in available work, educational, and treatment programs during the period of his incarceration. The Board has also considered a risk and needs assessment and whether risk reduction programs could effectively minimize Mr. Wilborn's risk of recidivism. After applying this standard to the circumstances of Mr. Wilborn's case, the Board is of the unanimous opinion that Mr. Wilborn is not yet rehabilitated and, therefore, does not merit parole at this time.

Mr. Wilborn's next appearance before the Board will take place in five years from the date of this hearing. During the interim, the Board encourages Mr. Wilborn to continue working towards his full rehabilitation.

*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.*

  
Gloriana Moroney, General Counsel

7/20/16  
Date