



*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*

**Terrence M. Reidy**  
*Secretary*

*Telephone: (508)-650-4500*

*Facsimile: (508)-650-4599*

**Tonomey A. Coleman**  
*Acting Chair*

**Lian Hogan**  
*Executive Director*

**RECORD OF DECISION**

**IN THE MATTER OF**

**VAL MAYFIELD**  
**AKA KHALID A. MAYFIELD**  
**AKA VAL MATEEN**  
**W40860**

**TYPE OF HEARING:**        **Review Hearing**

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

**DATE OF DECISION:**     **July 29, 2025**

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

**VOTE:** Parole is denied with a review in 2 years from the date of the hearing.<sup>2</sup>

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY:** On November 3, 1984, in Suffolk Superior Court, Val Mayfield was convicted of murder in the first-degree for the death of 11-year-old Maryann Hanley. He was sentenced to life in prison without the possibility of parole.<sup>3</sup> Mr. Mayfield was 17-years-old at the time of the murder, making him parole eligible following the Supreme Judicial Court's decision in *Diatchenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District*, 466 Mass. 655 (2013). Parole was denied after an initial hearing in 2015, and after a review hearing in 2023.<sup>4</sup> On March 20, 2025, Val Mayfield appeared before the Board for a review hearing. He was represented by Attorney

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Two Board Members voted to grant parole to an LTRP after six months in lower security.

<sup>3</sup> Mr. Mayfield's first jury trial occurred in April 1984. He was acquitted of rape, but the jury could not reach a unanimous verdict as to the murder indictment. A second jury trial resulted in the sentence now serving.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Mayfield postponed a review hearing in 2020.

Stephen Maidman. The Board's decision fully incorporates by reference the entire video recording of Val Mayfield's March 20, 2025, hearing.

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE:** On August 2, 1983, in Dorchester, 17-year-old Val Mayfield killed 11-year-old Mary Ann Hanley. At the time, Mr. Mayfield was living with Miss Hanley and her family in Dorchester. Mr. Mayfield and Ms. Hanley's half-sister had a child together. On the day of her death, Ms. Hanley had been reported missing at 9:00 p.m. Earlier that day, she had pointed Mr. Mayfield out to a person from whom Mr. Mayfield had stolen a gym bag and sneakers. Mr. Mayfield returned the property when confronted about the theft. Later that evening, Mr. Mayfield joined a group of youths who had gathered on the porch of a house across the street from a park. Ms. Hanley was present in the group. When most of the group left to see a movie, both Mr. Mayfield and Ms. Hanley left for home in different directions.

Ms. Hanley's body was discovered the following morning, at approximately 2:00 a.m., by a neighbor. Initial observations indicated Ms. Hanley had been beaten about her face, head, and neck. She was also found to be bleeding from her vaginal area. An autopsy revealed the cause of death to be strangulation with a ligature. Subsequent investigation indicated that Mr. Mayfield followed the victim into the park and confronted her about exposing his theft earlier that day. Mr. Mayfield started to hit the victim multiple times, eventually knocking her to the ground with a tree limb. When she would not get up, Mr. Mayfield smashed her head into the tree limb four times. After turning Ms. Hanley on her back, Mr. Mayfield placed his fingers under her nose to check if she was breathing. Mr. Mayfield then removed Ms. Hanley's clothing and raped her.<sup>5</sup>

**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 (if applicable).

In the context of an incarcerated individual convicted of first or second-degree murder, who was a juvenile at the time 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 murder, has a meaningful opportunity to obtain release based on demonstrated maturity and rehabilitation. *Diatchenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District*, 466 Mass. 655, 674 (2013). See also *Commonwealth v. Okoro*, 471 Mass. 51 (2015). The factors considered by the Board include a juvenile's "lack of maturity and an underdeveloped sense of responsibility, leading to recklessness, impulsivity, and heedless risk-taking; vulnerability to negative influences and outside pressures, including from their family and peers; limited control over their own

---

<sup>5</sup> Although Mr. Mayfield was acquitted of rape in 1983, Mr. Mayfield admitted to the Board, in 2015, that he had raped Miss Hanley.

environment; lack of the ability to extricate themselves from horrific, crime-producing settings; and unique capacity to change as they grow older." *Diatchenko v. District Attorney for the Suffolk District*, 471 Mass. 12, 30 (2015). The Board also recognizes the incarcerated individual's right to be represented by counsel during their appearance before the Board. *Id.* at 20-24.

**DECISION OF THE BOARD:** The Board considered the Miller/Diatchenko factors. The Board notes his past involvement with drugs and alcohol, the nature of the underlying offense, and his institutional behavior. While Mr. Mayfield has remained disciplinary report free and involved at the Mass Treatment Center since his last hearing 2 years ago, the Board still has concerns that Mr. Mayfield lacks insight into his behaviors. Mr. Mayfield presented new information to the Board regarding his impulsivity during the underlying crime. There is strong community opposition to Mr. Mayfield's release. Given the Board's concerns regarding Mr. Mayfield's insight into his behaviors, the egregious circumstances of the underlying crime and his other offenses, and the strong community opposition, the Board finds his release not compatible with the welfare of society. Four members of Ms. Hanley's family, as well as Suffolk County Assistant District Attorney Montez Haywood, testified in opposition to parole.

*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.*

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Tonomey A. Coleman, Acting Chair

7/29/25  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date