



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

**TANZERIOUS ANDERSON**  
**W80114**

**TYPE OF HEARING:** Initial Hearing  
**DATE OF HEARING:** August 12, 2025  
**DATE OF DECISION:** January 22, 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 an approved home plan on or after two weeks from the issuance of this Decision.<sup>2</sup>

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** Tanzerious Anderson was convicted of murder in the first degree, armed robbery, and illegal possession of a firearm on April 4, 2002, by a jury in Suffolk Superior Court. As a result of Mr. Anderson's first-degree murder conviction, he was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.<sup>3</sup>

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

<sup>1</sup> Board Member Gomez Jr. was not present for the hearing, but he reviewed the video recording of the hearing and the entirety of the file prior to vote. Board Member Coleman was present for the hearing; however, he departed the Board prior to vote.

<sup>2</sup> One Board Member voted to grant parole after an additional 90 days in minimum security.

<sup>3</sup> As to his remaining convictions, Mr. Anderson was ordered to serve the following sentences concurrently with his life sentence: 18-20 years for armed robbery and 4-5 years for illegal possession of a firearm. These sentences have since expired.

On August 12, 2025, Mr. Anderson appeared before the Board for his initial hearing and was represented by Attorney Lisa Newman-Polk. The Board's decision fully incorporates by reference the entire video recording of Mr. Anderson's August 12, 2025, hearing.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:** Imam Yazbek was killed on March 27, 2000, during a robbery at an apartment complex in Brighton, which was planned and orchestrated by Mr. 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. 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.

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:** This was Mr. Anderson's first appearance before the Board. He was 19-years-old at the time of the offense. He is currently 44-years-old and has served 25 years in prison. Mr. Anderson began investing in self-development prior to the Mattis decision. He is currently in minimum. Mr. Anderson addressed his need areas through programming that included Violence Reduction, Restorative Justice, Knowledge in Recovery, Occupational Skills Development, and education. He has been accepted to MyTERN and engaged in higher education in the DOC, earning credits toward his associate degree. Mr. Anderson has only had one guilty disciplinary report in 25 years. The Board considered the forensic evaluation and testimony from Dr. Herzog, who deems him low risk for violence and low risk for recidivism. He has a significant support system and re-entry plan that will address his need areas related to long-term incarceration. The Board considered testimony in support of parole from members of Mr. Anderson's friends and family. The Board considered testimony in opposition to parole from Suffolk County Assistant District Attorneys John Verner and Montez Haywood. The Board concludes by unanimous decision that Tanzerious Anderson has demonstrated a level of rehabilitation that would make his release compatible with the welfare of society.

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:** Approve home plan before release; Waive work for 2 weeks or program; Must be home between 10:00 PM – 6:00 AM or curfew at discretion of parole officer; 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.

*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

January 22, 2026  
Date