

Charles D. Baker Governor

Karyn Polito Lieutenant Governor

Thomas A. Turco III Secretary



PAROLE BOARD

12 Mercer Road Natick, Massachusetts 01760

> Telephone # (508) 650-4500 Facsimile # (508) 650-4599



Gloriann Moroney Chair

Kevin Keefe Executive Director

DECISION IN THE MATTER OF JAMIE BEY W45191 Review Hearing

TYPE OF HEARING:

DATE OF HEARING:

April 23, 2019

DATE OF DECISION:

January 23, 2020

PARTICIPATING BOARD MEMBERS: Dr. Charlene Bonner, Tonomey Coleman, Sheila Dupre, Tina Hurley, Gloriann Moroney, Colette Santa

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 the 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 a suitable candidate for parole. Parole is granted to a Long Term Residential Program with special conditions, but not before 18 months in lower security and District Attorney clearance.

I. STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On November 28, 1987, in Middlesex Superior Court, Jamie Bey pleaded guilty to the second-degree murder of Ruben Pazcel. He was sentenced to life in prison with the possibility of parole. That same day, he was also sentenced to 3 - 5 years concurrent with his life sentence for unlawfully carrying a dangerous weapon (shotgun).

On November 28, 1987, at Jilly's Barroom in Chelsea, Angel Iraola and Erasmus Martinez offered Jamie Bey (age 20) \$15,000 to kill a man. Mr. Martinez said that the man had cheated him in a cocaine deal. Following the conversation, the three men left the bar in a pickup truck owned by Mr. Martinez. Mr. Martinez drove to a residence and obtained a sawed off shotgun. The three men then drove around until they spotted their intended target walking with Mr. Pazcel. Mr. Bey (armed with the shotgun) and Mr. Iraola exited the pickup truck. When the intended victim saw the shotgun, he ducked and ran away. Mr. Bey fired the shotgun, striking 18-year-old Ruben Pazcel. As Mr. Pazcel lay moaning and bleeding, Mr. Bey approached and

shot him again. Mr. Pazcel died from the gunshot wounds. Mr. Bey and Mr. Iraola then returned to the pickup truck driven by Mr. Martinez, and the three men drove away. On December 1, 1987, Mr. Iraola contacted the Chelsea Police Department and identified Mr. Bey as the shooter and Mr. Martinez as the getaway driver. Jamie Bey was arrested on December 2, 1987, for the murder of Ruben Pazcel.

II. PAROLE HEARING ON APRIL 23, 2019

On April 23, 2019, Jamie Bey, now 51-years-old, appeared before the Parole Board for a review hearing and was represented by Attorney Rebecca Rose. Mr. Bey was denied parole after both his 2002 initial hearing and his 2007 review hearing. He postponed his hearings in 2012 and 2017. In his opening statement to the Board, Mr. Bey apologized to the Pazcel family. When the Board questioned him about his childhood, Mr. Bey described how he had received a traumatic brain injury after falling from a third story porch. He was between 5 and 6-years-old. Mr. Bey said that (according to his mother) he was taken to a church where she and some pastors prayed over him. He was subsequently "brought back to life." Mr. Bey said that he never received medical attention for his injuries, thus incurring significant life-long cognitive problems and memory issues.

Mr. Bey told the Board that he has no memory of a sex offense that resulted in his commitment at 12-years-old. He joined a security threat group at age 15 and, at the time of the murder, had a young son and daughter. When the Board questioned him about the underlying offense, Mr. Bey said that he had been drinking in a bar when he was approached by Mr. Martinez and Mr. Iraola. The two men offered him \$15,000 to kill a man who had "stung" them in a drug deal. Mr. Bey said that he agreed to commit the murder because he was out of work at the time and had trouble providing for his girlfriend and two children. In addition, he had been drinking. He told the Board that "it seemed like a solution to my problems."

When the Board questioned him about his progress in rehabilitative programming, Mr. Bey said that he completed Correctional Recovery Academy and participates in Alcoholics Anonymous regularly. He completed several Alternatives to Violence programs, as well as a welding and OSHA course. He is also active in faith based programs. Mr. Bey explained that he was ineligible to continue with the Sex Offenders Treatment Program (SOTP) after it was determined that he had a low risk to re-offend. He has had several jobs during his incarceration, including employment as a greenhouse/garden worker at NCCI-Gardner since 2016. Hope Grassi, LICSW, testified that Mr. Bey has a low I.Q. which has affected his ability to complete some programs. She believes, however, that he could succeed on parole despite his cognitive challenges with the benefit of a structured program.

Mr. Bey stated that he has remained sober since his arrest in 1987, and has been drug free since 1994. He also reported that his security threat group renouncement was accepted in 2000. When Board Members questioned him about his last disciplinary report (in 2015) for unauthorized possession of money, Mr. Bey explained that he was found with the proceeds of a winning football bet. Mr. Bey has requested release to a lower security facility for 6 months to one year, followed by a move to a pre-release facility. Eventually, he hopes to be released to the Salvation Army's Adult Rehabilitation program, where he will be provided one-on-one

counseling and case management to help him re-integrate into society. Mr. Bey stated that he has the support of his family and plans to work as a welder.

The Board considered a psychological evaluation submitted by Psychologist Paul Nestor, Ph.D. and an intellectual assessment submitted by Psychologist Frank DiCataldo, Ph.D. The Board also considered the testimony of Hope Grassi, LICSW. The Suffolk County District Attorney's Office submitted a letter in opposition to parole.

III. DECISION

It is the opinion of the Board that Mr. Bey has made strides in his rehabilitation that would make his release compatible with the welfare of society.

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. Bey'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. Bey's risk of recidivism. After applying this appropriately high standard to the circumstances of Mr. Bey's case, the Board is of the unanimous opinion that Mr. Bey merits parole at this time. Parole is granted to a Long Term Residential Program with special conditions, but not before 18 months in lower security and District Attorney clearance.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: Waive work for Long Term Residential Program; Must be home between 10PM and 6AM; Electronic monitoring; Supervise for drugs, testing in accordance with agency policy; Supervise for alcohol abstinence, testing in accordance with agency policy; Report to assigned MA Parole Office on day of release; Must have mental health counseling for adjustment/transition; Long Term Residential Treatment minimum of 6 months; AA/NA at least three times/week.

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

lecision.

Pamela Murphy, General Counsel

32020