



*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**

**EDWARD DIAS**  
**W42462**

**TYPE OF HEARING:** Initial Hearing

**DATE OF HEARING:** December 16, 2025

**DATE OF DECISION:** March 23, 2026

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

**VOTE:** Parole is granted to a Long-Term Residential Program 2 weeks after the issuance of Decision.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On May 23, 1986, following a joint jury trial in Bristol Superior Court, Mr. Dias was convicted of murder in the first-degree for the death of Frank Rose. He was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole. On that same date, he received a concurrent sentence of 75-to-90 years for burglary with armed assault on occupants. On June 13, 1989, the Supreme Judicial Court (SJC) reversed the judgments of conviction, and the cases were remanded for separate trials. On November 9, 1991, after Mr. Dias was tried separately on each charge in Bristol Superior Court, he was found guilty of burglary with armed assault on occupants and first-degree murder. He received two concurrent life sentences without the possibility of parole.

Mr. Dias 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. Dias was re-sentenced to life with the possibility of parole after 15 years.

On December 16, 2025, Mr. Dias appeared before the Board for an initial hearing. He was represented by Attorney Catherine Hinton. The Board's decision fully incorporates by reference the entire video recording of Mr. Dias' December 16, 2025, hearing.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:** On November 30, 1984, 19-year-old Edward Dias and his co-defendant stabbed and killed 76-year-old Frank Rose during a burglary in Dighton. That morning, Mr. Dias and his co-defendant discussed a plan to commit robbery. The co-defendant was familiar with Mr. Rose's house (having worked on his farm) and suggested that money would be found there. Mr. Dias and his co-defendant watched Mr. Rose come and go from the house throughout the day. When Mr. Rose returned home in the evening, the men entered his house and stabbed him. After an hour or more had passed, Mr. Dias and his co-defendant returned to the house and ascertained that Mr. Rose was dead. They stole a television set, money, and his pickup truck.

A neighbor discovered Mr. Rose's body on December 2, 1984. Mr. Rose's house had been ransacked. The neighbor telephoned the police and reported that Mr. Rose's pickup truck was also missing. Police officers located the pickup truck near the co-defendant's apartment building in Fall River. Subsequent investigation led to the arrest of Mr. Dias and his co-defendant. Mr. Dias was interviewed and admitted to his involvement in the burglary and murder of Mr. Rose.

**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. Dias presented for the first time before the Parole Board. He was 19-years-old at the time of the offense; he is now 60-years-old and has been incarcerated for 41 years. Mr. Dias reported a significant history of trauma, including being victimized in the

institution. He has had numerous hospitalizations at Bridgewater State Hospital. The Board considered the expert forensic evaluation by Dr. Guidry, who provided a detailed history of Mr. Dias' trauma, mental health treatment and current level of functioning. Dr. Guidry also provided evidence-based risk assessments the Board considered in rendering its decision. Mr. Dias has invested in his rehabilitation; he has addressed his need areas and presents as committed to ongoing treatment. He has been sober for over 7 years, he earned his Hi-Set and has worked as a companion in the Department of Correction by assisting other inmates with medical and/or mental health needs. Mr. Dias worked with a social worker to establish a release plan that will continue to meet his needs. Mr. Dias is currently in a minimum-security facility and has been doing well for over 5 months. The Board considered the testimony of Dr. Guidry and a social worker in support of parole. The Board also considered both the testimony of Mr. Rose's family member and a written submission by Bristol County ADA Jennifer Purcell in opposition to parole. The Board concludes by unanimous decision that Edward Dias has demonstrated a level of rehabilitation that would make his release compatible with the welfare of society.

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:** Waive work for 2 weeks or program; Electronic monitoring for 6 months; Supervise for drugs, testing in accordance with Agency policy; Supervise for liquor abstinence, testing in accordance with Agency policy; Report to assigned MA Parole Office on day of release; No contact with victim's family; Must have mental health counseling for adjustment; Long Term Residential Program.

*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