

*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*

**Charles D. Baker**  
*Governor*

**Karyn Polito**  
*Lieutenant Governor*

**Thomas A. Turco III**  
*Secretary*

**Gloriann Moroney**  
*Chair*

**Kevin Keefe**  
*Executive Director*

**RECORD OF DECISION**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**STUART LOATMAN  
W34654**

**TYPE OF HEARING:** Review Hearing

**DATE OF HEARING:** March 30, 2021

**DATE OF DECISION:** July 29, 2021

**PARTICIPATING BOARD MEMBERS:** Dr. Charlene Bonner, Tonomey Coleman, Sheila Dupre, Tina Hurley, Colette Santa<sup>1</sup>

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:** On June 26, 1974, in Suffolk Superior Court, Stuart Loatman pleaded guilty to the second-degree murder of 67-year-old William Vemis (A.K.A. Basilio Vemis). He was sentenced to life in prison with the possibility of parole. Mr. Loatman also pleaded guilty to each of the non-homicide offenses for which he had been charged and received 12-20-year sentences for four counts of armed robbery, a 12–20-year sentence for unlawful possession of a shotgun, a 9–10-year sentence for assault with intent to murder, and a 9–10-year sentence for assault and battery with a dangerous weapon. All sentences were ordered to run concurrently.

Mr. Loatman appeared before the Parole Board for a review hearing on March 30, 2021 and was represented by Attorney Robert Hennessy. This was Mr. Loatman’s first appearance before the Board since his final rescission hearing in 2020. Mr. Loatman was returned to higher security in 2019. His positive parole vote was rescinded due to institutional violations. The entire video recording of Mr. Loatman’s March 30, 2021, hearing is fully incorporated by reference to the Board’s decision.

**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 a unanimous vote that the inmate is a suitable candidate for parole. Reserve to the Community Resources for Justice – Transitional Housing – Brooke House. Mr. Loatman received a positive parole vote in 2018. His parole was rescinded prior to release for leaving his worksite without permission

<sup>1</sup> Chair Moroney recused.


and was returned to higher custody. He was sufficiently sanctioned and has since been returned to minimum custody. Mr. Loatman remains suitable for parole as previously decided by the Board.


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 the context of an offender convicted of first or second-degree murder, who was a juvenile at the time of the offense was committed, the Board takes into consideration the attributes of youth that distinguish juvenile homicide offenders from similarly situated adult offenders. Consideration of these factors ensures that the parole candidate, who was a juvenile at the time they committed the murder, has "A real chance to demonstrate maturity and rehabilitation." *Diatchenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District*, 471 Mass. 12, 30 (2015); See also *Commonwealth v. Okoro*, 471 Mass. 51 (2015). The factors considered by the Board include the offender's "lack of maturity and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility, leading to recklessness, impulsivity, and heedless risk-taking; vulnerability to negative influences and outside pressure, including from their family and peers; limited control over their own environment; lack of the ability to extricate themselves from horrific, crime-producing settings; and unique capacity to change as they grow older." *Id.*

The Board considered Mr. Loatman's institutional behavior, as well as his participation in available work, educational, and treatment programs during the period of incarceration. The Board also considered a risk and needs assessment, and whether risk reduction programs could effectively minimize Mr. Loatman's risk of recidivism. After applying this appropriately high standard to the circumstances of Mr. Loatman's case, the Board is of the unanimous opinion that Stuart Loatman is rehabilitated and, therefore, merits parole at this time.

**Special Conditions:** Reserve to CRJ-Transitional House: Brooke House; Waive work for two weeks; Must be at home between 10 p.m. and 6 a.m.; ELMO-electronic monitoring; 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); Must have mental health counseling for adjustment/transition; AA/NA at least 3 times/week; Mandatory, Sponsor.

*I certify that this is the decision and reasons of the Massachusetts Parole Board regarding the above referenced hearing.*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Pamela Murphy, General Counsel

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date