



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 Kwon
Secretary

Telephone: (508)-650-4500

Facsimile: (508)-650-4599

Angelo Gomez, Jr.
Chair

Lian Hogan
Executive Director

RECORD OF DECISION

IN THE MATTER OF

TERRELL MARTIN
W62874

TYPE OF HEARING: Initial Hearing

DATE OF HEARING: July 15, 2025

DATE OF DECISION: January 6, 2026

PARTICIPATING BOARD MEMBERS: Edith J. Alexander, Dr. Charlene Bonner, Sarah B. Coughlin, Angelo Gomez, Jr., James Kelcourse, Rafael Ortiz¹

VOTE: Parole is granted to an approved home plan after 6 months total in lower security.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY: On June 16, 1999, in Suffolk Superior Court, a jury convicted Terrell Martin² of first-degree murder (felony murder theory). Mr. Martin received a sentence of life in prison without the possibility of parole.³

Mr. Martin 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, with regard to Mr. Martin's first-degree murder conviction, the mittimus was corrected to reflect that Mr. Martin would become parole eligible after serving 15 years of his life sentence.

On July 15, 2025, Mr. Martin appeared before the Board for an initial hearing. He was represented by Attorney Elizabeth Caddick.

¹ Board Member Coleman participated in the hearing, but was not on the Board at the time of vote.

² At the time of the offense, Mr. Terrell's legal name was Edward Paulding.

³ The jury also convicted Mr. Martin of unlawful possession of a firearm, and he received a 3 to 5 year concurrent sentence. On that same date, he was found guilty of three counts of armed robbery, and charges were placed on file. The armed robbery convictions were vacated following appeal.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE: On August 23, 1996, Luis Tevenal was shot and killed during a robbery at Dennis Street Park in Roxbury. A witness observed 20-year-old Terrell Martin (formerly known as Edward Paulding) and Jose Duarte pass by on bicycles. Mr. Martin (who was wearing a hood over his head) and Mr. Duarte approached three men in the park, including Mr. Tevenal. Armed with a handgun, Mr. Duarte pointed the gun at the three men and stated, "Run you all [expletive]," which was interpreted as an instruction to turn over their belongings. In response, Mr. Tevenal tossed his wallet on the ground in Mr. Martin's direction. Mr. Duarte asked Mr. Martin, "Le tiru?" which the victims understood to mean, "Should I shoot?" The men ran, and a shot was fired. One of the surviving victims was struck in the shoulder at the same time Mr. Tevenal fell to the ground. At some point, Mr. Martin was questioned by police and admitted to participating in the armed robbery.

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. Martin appeared for his initial hearing following the Supreme Judicial Court's *Mattis* decision. The Board considered the application of the *Mattis* factors to the facts and circumstances. He has been disciplinary report free for approximately 6 years. He has been incarcerated for 28 years. His engagement in programming has been limited, but is notable for Violence Reduction and Criminal Thinking. The Board reviewed Dr. Guidry's evaluation and

noted Mr. Martin's adverse childhood experiences. Dr. Guidry did not find any significant mental health concerns. Mr. Martin is encouraged to engage in community supports as identified by Dr. Guidry. The Board considered testimony in support of parole from Mr. Martin's brother, niece, and son. The Board concludes by unanimous decision that Terrell Martin has demonstrated a level of rehabilitation that would make his release compatible with the welfare of society.

SPECIAL CONDITIONS: Approve home plan prior to release; Waive work for 2 weeks; Must be home between 10PM and 6AM 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 victims' 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 6, 2026

Date