



*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**

**JASON ROBINSON**  
**W80113**

**TYPE OF HEARING:** Initial Hearing

**DATE OF HEARING:** August 20, 2025

**DATE OF DECISION:** February 12, 2026

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

**VOTE:** Parole is granted to CRJ or Dismas House on/after 90 days total in minimum.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** Jason Robinson was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole following his April 4, 2002, conviction in Suffolk Superior Court of murder in the first degree for the killing of Inaam Yazbek. He was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.<sup>2</sup>

Mr. Robinson 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 eighteen through twenty 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, the mittimus relating to Mr. Robinson's first-degree murder conviction was corrected to reflect that his life sentence now carried the possibility of parole after 15 years.

On August 20, 2025, Mr. Robinson appeared before the Board for an initial hearing and was represented by Attorney Rosemary Scapicchio. The Board's decision fully incorporates by reference the entire video recording of Mr. Robinson's August 20, 2025, hearing.

<sup>1</sup> Board Members Ortiz and Alexander were not present for the hearing; however, both reviewed the video recording of the hearing and the entirety of the file prior to vote. Board Member Coleman participated in the hearing but departed the Board prior to vote.

<sup>2</sup> Following an appeal in 2024, Robinson's conviction for unlawful possession of a firearm was reversed and the verdict was set aside. Commonwealth v. Robinson, 493 Mass. 303 (2024).

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:** Imam Yazbek was killed on March 28, 2000, during a robbery at an apartment complex in Brighton, which was planned and orchestrated by Tanzerious Anderson, Joleena Tate, and Jason Robinson. Earlier in the day, Ms. Tate asked Mr. Anderson if he wanted to “rob someone,” as he was preparing to leave a friend’s house. Mr. Anderson agreed to participate in the robbery and invited Mr. Robinson to join. Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Robinson if he was “down for a robbery,” and Mr. Robinson agreed. Ms. Tate suggested robbing Mr. Yazbek because she knew him to carry large amounts of cash and believed that he would be passive during a robbery. The three agreed that Ms. Tate would contact Mr. Yazbek and make the arrangements. In accordance with their plan, Ms. Tate and Mr. Yazbek had dinner and drove to 89 Faneuil Street, where Ms. Tate expected Mr. Anderson and Mr. Robinson to be waiting. The two men had not yet arrived so, in an effort to stall, Ms. Tate took Mr. Yazbek outside. When Mr. Anderson and Mr. Robinson arrived at 89 Faneuil Street, Ms. Tate stated, “We’re being robbed,” and then walked away. The men led Mr. Yazbek inside. About five minutes later, Ms. Tate heard a loud noise. Another witness heard a loud noise and observed Mr. Anderson and Mr. Robinson running from the building. Mr. Anderson, Mr. Robinson, and Ms. Tate left in Mr. Anderson’s car.

Shortly after the murder, Mr. Anderson told Ms. Tate that the men instructed the victim to keep his hands up and not look behind him; however, he continued to move his hands and reached for the doorknob. The victim expressed that he was a good person, did not want any trouble, and knew people in the area. Mr. Anderson believed that the victim stated, “Police, police.” Despite the victim denying that he was a police officer, Mr. Anderson panicked and shot him.

**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 eighteen through twenty 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. Robinson presented for his initial hearing before the Parole Board. Mr. Robinson was 19-years-old at the time of the offense. He is now 53-years-old and has been incarcerated for 25 years. Mr. Robinson began his investment in self-development prior to the Mattis decision. He is currently in minimum security. Mr. Robinson completed numerous programs related to his needs area. He was also a cadre worker prior to Mattis and has been disciplinary report free since 2011. Mr. Robinson is a state-certified peer specialist and has gained numerous occupational skills to assist him with employment in the community. He also completed the Inside Out Program through Bridgewater State University. Mr. Robinson has a significant support system that includes individuals who have experience with reintegration following long periods of incarceration. The Board heard testimony in support of parole from Mr. Robinson's friends, family, and a former teacher. The Board heard testimony in opposition to parole from Suffolk County Assistant District Attorney Montez Haywood. The Board concludes by unanimous decision that Jason Robinson 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; Must be home between 10 PM and 6 AM or PO discretion for curfew; Electronic monitoring for 6 months; Supervise for drugs with testing in accordance with Agency policy; Supervise for liquor abstinence with 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 - Dismas House or CRJ.

*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

February 12, 2026  
Date