CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS

DECISION

2

3

1

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MEIGHAN: On the record.

4

5

PRESIDING COMMISSIONER BARTON: Good afternoon,

6

everyone. This is Commissioner Barton again, and we are on the record for the 15th subsequent life parole

7

consideration hearing for Mr. Sirhan CDCR number B21014.

8

The time is now 1:05 PM. on August 27th of 2021. All the

9

parties that were previously present for the hearing are

10

with us again for pronouncement of the Panel's decision. This is a very weighty decision today that we have to

11

make. We recognize that it has to be based on whether or

13

not Mr. Sirhan continues to pose an unreasonable risk to

14

public safety and any denial has to be based on evidence

15

in the record of his current dangerousness. In making our

16 17 decision, we are required by law to give great weight to the mitigating effects of the diminished culpability of

18

youth as compared to adults, the hallmark features of

19

youth and any subsequent growth and increased maturity in

20

reviewing his suitability for parole. We are also required

21

to give special consideration to his age, his long-term

23

confinement and diminished physical condition. We also

200

consider all other, uh, relevant evidence, including his

24

entire Central file, his recent Comprehensive Risk SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Assessment, prior Comprehensive Risk Assessments, additional documents he and his Attorney have submitted for the hearing. We have numerous, uh, letters in support and also letters in opposition to his parole from the public that are considered. We've considered the testimony of Mr. Sirhan, the comments of his Attorney. Uh, I think a couple of times, uh, it was misrepresented on the record that we have an opposition letter that was received recently from Los Angeles Sheriff, it's actually from the Los Angeles Police Department. It is dated August 26th of 2021, it is signed by Michael Moore. The Chief of Police, uh, actually signed for him by Captain Jonathan Tippett, Commanding Officer, Robbery and Homicide Division, so it's actually the LAPD letter in opposition that we have. We also have heard statements from surviving victim, Mr. Schrade, from victim family members, um, victims' representatives, which have all been considered. We also have letters from victims' family members, uh, both the one I read into the record as well as ones from others, uh, that chose to remain confidential, but have been considered. We've also considered Mr. Sirhan's, uh, confidential file. There is information there that, um, we reviewed. There was one entry from 2019 that both the Department as well as our independent review found to be SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 2

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unreliable and not relevant to the proceedings here today. We talked to him about the rest of his record and, uh, talked to him about the incident in 2016 also, which, um, was something that was pertinent in the last hearing in that it showed perhaps a lapse in judgment at that time, um, but it's been five years since then. I will say both myself and Commissioner Meighan, um, have spent hours preparing for this case, and as I said, it's a weighted decision. I agree with Mr. Kennedy and quite frankly disagree with Ms. Berry that, um, this is not like any other homicide. This is a political assassination and it does have wide ranging impact, much more so than the typical homicide that we see. That's not to say that any life is any more sacred or missed than another in our opinion, um, and we recognize that. And so that factor is given the weight that we deemed appropriate and I will go into that. Also, we note that the State of California and he was convicted under California statutes is a presumptive State, meaning to deny parole there has to be evidence in the record of current dangerousness that rises to the level of being an unreasonable risk of current danger to public safety. We also recognize that it's not our job to change anything that's been done by a sentencing court. And so, we view Mr. Sirhan in the light SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 3

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of having committed these offenses regardless of what other information has been provided either by him or by others. This Panel also notes that this is a de novo hearing, meaning that while prior findings and information in the file can certainly inform us in our decision, none of that is binding. We make an independent decision based on our own training, experience and moral conviction. And I will say, while I know Ms. Meighan is a dedicated public servant, I have 40 years in public service and have given an oath to uphold the constitution of both California and the US on numerous occasions at numerous levels. And I certainly hold that oath to be what grounds my moral convictions and decisions. In doing this job, I don't think you could do it otherwise. Having said all of that and taking into consideration the comments and concerns of everyone involved, based on the legal standards and the evidence that we have before us today, we're finding that he does not, Mr. Sirhan pose an unreasonable risk to public safety and we're finding him suitable for parole today. Having said that Mr. Sirhan, bear with me because this decision is gonna be reviewed by many eyes and so I want to make sure that I'm thorough in giving the reasons for our decision. Certainly, anyone else on the hearing, you're not obligated to remain for purposes of the SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 4

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

decision, you're welcome to, but you're certainly not obligated to after this point. You, however, Mr. Sirhan are, so, well actually that's not true. You could absent yourself at this point if you wanted to, but I recommend you stay there. All right. So here are the reasons for our decision and the analysis that we undertook. First of all, we are cognizant of the law in this State, Penal Code, Section 5011, the Board cannot require an admission of guilt as a requirement for parole. California Code of Regulations, Title 15, Section 2236 indicates an inmate can refuse to discuss facts of the crime and the refusal shall not be held against the inmate, and we are certainly following those laws today. And I say that because, uh, the two factors that we saw that were still problematic, the first one being the aggravating factor of the crime itself, we did give due weight to, and there are some crimes that are so extremely aggravating that the crime itself carries so much weight. In order to outweigh that, the factors in mitigation have to be overwhelming. This Panel found that today, that is the case. That the factors in mitigation are overwhelming, such that they overtake the crime, notwithstanding its atrocity, not with -withstanding its impact on not just the families and the victims and the nation as a whole, perhaps the world as a SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 5

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

whole. And if you had been sentenced to life without parole, that would be a different matter, but you were sentenced to life with parole. And I had that brief discourse with Ms. Berry about our sentencing laws today, but over time laws change and we are bound as judicial officers to follow the law that is existing now and the law that existed at the time. And while I find this crime to be extremely aggravated and I find your, uh, personal responsibility for it to not be perfect, we felt that those things are overwhelmingly outweighed by the factors of mitigation that I will also go through. And having said that, again, looking at the crime, there are times when we see crimes that are horrendous, that 20 years doesn't seem like enough to serve, 30 years, even 40 years, but to serve 53 years or close to 55, I guess on this crime, uh, I think it's '68 to now, I think it's 53 years, um, we think certainly adequately has under the law justified the punishment phase of incarceration. The other things, the other goals of incarceration of course are rehabilitation and to a certain degree incapacitation, and to the degree that you are now 77 years old and we factor in those elderly offender considerations, we think you're significantly incapacitated also as far as committing additional crimes, and I will go into that as well. But we SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 6

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do find the crime itself to be extremely aggravated. There were multiple victims, there was a US Senator, potential presidential candidate, uh, it was done for, in your own mind, what you told us today, under the influence of alcohol and in response to anger over the Arab Israeli conflict, and so that's political motivation whether you want to call it that or not. And so, I don't want anyone to view this decision and think that somehow, we set that aside, we did not. We also do not set aside the fact that you, um, are denying memory of the events. At one point in time on the record, uh, you admitted committing the crime and shooting everyone and then during hearings and later discovery I suppose, uh, you came to the opinion that that was basically under the undue influence of a perhaps, uh, Attorney who had ethical issues. Then later you came to the understanding that, um, you were still responsible and today, and I want to say this because this is my notes in the record, you have again taken responsibility for firing the weapon, for bringing the gun there as we discussed, um, and for being in, as I think Mr. Kennedy put it, in the room, shooting a gun at people with malicious intent, regardless of whether your bullets killed somebody in particular or hurt someone in particular, you were there taking that action and it certainly caused, um, damage, SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 7

2

3

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

certainly caused injury and potentially death. Even if it wasn't your bullet, perhaps it was the distraction of your firing that allowed someone else to fire, I don't know I wasn't there. But I have to take the convictions as they stand, which is you being responsible for the murder and the assault with intent to commit murder. And so, in considering that we looked at other Panels and what they've done in the past, where they've analyzed your claims of innocence or partial claims of innocence, which is what we have today and made a determination that that therefore by claiming that innocence, that it was somehow implausible to the degree that it raised the question as to whether or not you had true remorse, true insight, or were lacking in personal responsibility. This Panel finds that whether plausible or implausible, at this stage with all of the other factors, you still do not pose an unreasonable risk to public safety because of the second prong of that test. The first test is whether or not it's implausible. Even if we were to find it implausible, we then would have to go to the second prong which would be, okay, if his defense is implausible, does it rise to the level that he's a current danger? And because of all the factors that I'm gonna go through now, we believe that that is not the case. And I say that again, because those SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 8

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

reviewing this, I don't want them to think that we're making an expressed finding of plausibility, because as I stated, even if implausible, we find that you no longer pose an unreasonable risk to public safety. Having said that, is your insight perfect, no. I don't know that anyone's insight is ever perfect, but we think that you have grown. And as was mentioned, in the last five years, since your last hearing, there are several things that have changed, not just the things that your Attorney raised, which I had on my list, but, um, there are a few more. Not only are you five years older at 77 and your physical condition has worsened, you've also got the youth offender factors, which was mentioned, and I'm gonna go over those that apply. Whether or not there's DA opposition doesn't even enter into the picture, at least as far as our consideration or determination of the case. Um, they obviously have opposed in the past and even assuming they opposed it today, our decision would be the same. But you've had five more years of discipline-free time, but more importantly than that, five more years of exercising good judgment. And as I said, decision might have been different in 2016 when I personally feel you had a lapse in judgment in that kitchen incident, you should have just walked away and quit the job and not risk even SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 9

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

having words. That being said, it seems from our discussion today that you've learned from that and you've grown from that and so that has changed. There's been no further lapses in judgment. We also see more programming, significantly more programming in several areas of selfawareness that we think was beneficial, uh, both in how you presented today. I wasn't present at the other hearings, but from reading the transcripts and having been involved in hundreds of hearings myself, at times in past hearings you appe -- appear to be verbally combative, if not, um, in some respects, uh, indignant. I did not sense that today whatsoever. I actually sensed from your demeanor and from your manner of responding, even when we would interrupt you and try to bring you back on track, because you do have a little bit of a tendency to stray, um, we were able to do so without any visible reaction, negative reaction on your part. And, um, so that was evident to us too and I believe that that's a change. In addition to which you have additional positive character references from Correctional Officers. And as I said before, we take that and give that great weight in -- in this sense. We get letters all the time in support and opposition, and obviously letters from family and friends of yours are typically going to be supportive. SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 10

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Obviously letters, oftentimes from victim family members are going to be the opposite. Here we have a mix. But nevertheless, we consider those people and their opinions as valid, but they're also to a certain degree, um, understood because of the positions they hold. And then we look at letters from the public at general, and we have a lot of letters in public here, and again, those are just people's opinions that don't have the information that we have in terms of everything in your record. And so, while we certainly consider that, it's not given a lot of weight. And then we move up to those letters from people that see you on a day-to-day basis, so free staff, like a kitchen supervisor or a volunteer leader or someone along those lines that seen you work in programs, seen you work with other inmates, seen you work, um, on the job, seeing that you get along with others, you follow, you know, people's direction, supervisors' direction and we see that over time, um, your reviews have been excellent in that regard. And then we get to that other level and that's Correctional Officers who, in my experience, don't have any incentive to write a support letter for any inmate. In fact, at times they have disincentive based upon how maybe their colleagues feel about them doing that. Having said that you have three fairly recent letters, all of which SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 11

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

are Correctional Officers that, and we put them on the record already, I don't have the names in front of me at the moment, but I did read all of them. And each one of them says basically the same thing, oh, here we go, Correctional Officer Mack, Correctional Officer Nolan, Correctional Officer, uh, Derek, each one of them says the same thing, that they see you day in-day out, good days, bad days when you know they're looking, when you don't know they're looking and that your character is one of, um, being a prosocial individual who following directions, who avoid problems, avoids problem inmates and does not display anger or loss of temper. And we know that that was one of the things at play at the time of this crime, so that is showing offender change from people who see you on a daily basis. And so, we give those perhaps more weight than we give others, because they see you on that daily basis. And then we had the one, which while it's dated from 1983, the reason it is even mentioned is because within our own training and experience, when we look at, um, whether or not someone is rehabilitated, we look at not just can they do time, in other words, without getting disciplined. And apparently not everyone realizes this, but we do see many inmates who do 20, 30 years with very few discipline write-ups. Now we see many that have a ton SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 12

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of them too. So, I'm not saying that it's not exemplary, but you're not the first person, you're probably the first person I've seen that's done 53 years with only two that were older 42 years old, but I've seen people with 30 years and no write-ups. So that alone though, wouldn't necessarily, uh, in and of itself show that you've changed although it is good evidence to your conduct, but we also look for those things that show you've gone beyond that. And the fact that you were willing to step in, assist an officer when he was in potential danger and that officer wrote of that, is also something that speaks to underlying, uh, character trait and that was actually, uh, several decades back. So, we considered those things. We also considered the fact that when we look at one's criminal history, that's one of the factors both under the regulations and under our structured decision-making that we have to consider. Not only do you have no prior criminal history, which is a mitigator, you don't even have any prior instances of violence in your record before this crime. So, no prior instances of violence. And then as I said, in the last 40 something years, no serious rule violations of any kind, um, certainly no overt violence of any kind. Your last even counseling chrono was in 2010, which is over 11 years ago and everything else predated SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 13

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

into the 70s, um, and the one instance in 1990. So that is also a mitigating factor in that your institutional history is exemplary. Your lack of prior criminal record is mitigating. You also, obviously had never been on supervised release, so because you've never been convicted of anything. As far as any substance abuse issues, we do find that alcohol was a factor in this crime through your own admission, but we also find that you programmed considerably to address that both through AA, through the substance use disorder treatment program and we are going to put conditions in place that will reinforce your sobriety and reinforce, um, your ability to maintain what you've expressed to us, which is a conviction to be alcohol-free for the rest of your life, so I'll get to that when we get to special conditions. We also recognize that you have, um, in prison as part of your adjustment, you haven't joined any gangs. You haven't been involved in, uh, a lot of the problems that other guys get them to, into, with negative associations in prison. We see upgrades in education, which is also mitigating, obtaining your AA, taking other college courses. You've tried to better yourself vocationally, there's a number of certificates in the record, I'm not gonna recite them all. You've completed the office services and related SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 14

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

technology course. Your work history, as I said, has been steady and positive. Um, you listened to what the last Commissioner said, which was, you know, increase your programming, and we see that you've done that. Again, I'm not going to necessarily list the 20 programs that you've done, but we find your self-help programming, especially, uh, in the last five years to be, um, commendable and mitigating. You have completed several what I would call cell-study or in-cell study, rather than what many have done, which is sit on their hands during COVID and feel like they didn't have to do anything to better themselves, you have been able to complete self-directed courses in stress, bouncing back resilience toolkit, uh, action plan for relapse prevention, cognitive behavior therapy, again the substance use disorder treatment which you actually took for a longer period of time, 6 months I believe that course was. Emotional intelligence workbook, communication skills workbook, anger management in 2020, dealing with your emotions in 2020. Um, you have gone, ongoing basis, for the las -- off and on for the last 5 years to lifer support group. You've gone through victim awareness, um, Tai Chi. Looks like you were in gateway to recovery, narcotics anonymous, uh, alcoholics anonymous and as you said, you even assisted in running some of those programs, SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 15

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

facilitating some of those programs. So, we do find your programming to be adequate and to be mitigating in the terms that it addressed, um, the risk factor, as far as your ability to recognize anger, emotional intelligence, deal with stress, because we do find that there were stressors at the time of this crime. There was the potential for PTSD having gone through what you went through as a child and then of course with your daughter, your not, excuse me, not your daughter, your sister dying recent, uh, recently before this. Um, while those certainly aren't excuses whatsoever for your actions, they are things that are considered because stressors that someone is under at the time of the crime are things that we can consider and have considered. In addition to that, it appears that as I said, your insight has improved. You talked about, today I think more clearly than in the past. One of the things I noted in past transcripts when asked a direct question, and this also has come up in your Risk Assessments, and I don't know if this is because you had legal actions pending, or because you were cautioned, uh, in the past by other Attorneys about what you said or how you said it, but it always appeared that you would evade, you would kind of skirt the issue, you would give answers that weren't really direct answers, but today we felt you SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 16

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

were very direct in saying, yeah, my feelings about the Middle East, my use of the alcohol that night were two major factors. You talked about, you know, character defects of being selfish, impulsive, reckless. Um, we had the discussion about even guns and alcohol being reckless as something that is just ranks up there with stupidity. And so as far as understanding your character defects, is it perfect? No, I probably would have thrown some more in there, but you also talked about lacking humility. You also talked about being in, you know, I think you said self-assured or cocky or something like that, but I would put that as lacking humility. Um, and then the fact that you certainly weren't seeking help from anyone else, we see that also as something that has changed. Your willingness to seek help from others that you didn't have as a 24-year-old. So, we believe that your insight has improved. It's certainly not perfect. Um, and as far as coping skills, you know, when we talked about emotion intelligence, you said that you do read, you do go out and exercise, you meditate, um, you're willing to talk to other people to resolve things. You certainly have taken the classes on conflict resolution and dealing with your emotions in a positive way. And that's why we had the discussion we had about the 2016 incident, because I think SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 17

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you summed it up later and maybe it was after the break, you had some more time to think about it, I don't know, but you said, yeah, now I have to look at the big picture and I have to recognize that, you know, at that time it was more about you may be feeling jealousy, that's another character defect. You know, this guy got a job you felt you should get and doggone if you were gonna quit the job, you know, but it appears that you understand that that was false pride and that that was something that you need to get rid of, because certainly as you go out in life, things may not be fair and you're gonna have to deal with that on a day-to-day basis. So, we thought your not only responses today were much better than in the past, but your understanding of who you are and your ability to deal with those things has improved. You also talked about yourself being, um, I don't know if you used the word ignorant, but you said ignoring what was going on. But I think that that's common too amongst youth defenders. So overall we found that offender change does, has existed and not just based upon maturation of age. We know the statistics; we know it drops significantly at 50 and at 60 recidivism drops dramatically. We also recognize that this crime was situational in a certain extent in that you weren't someone who had this long history of violence and SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 18

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

an escalating criminality that was going from thefts to robberies to assaults, to, you know, shootings to murder. I mean, for you, it was 0 to 100 in one instance, or may, if there something more than 100, I personally, uh, think that's high enough, but the reality is we've seen that there has been off -- offender change, both because of the elderly offender considerations, but also, I think through your own reflection and growth, um, even in how you approach these hearings. And so, I think that that to me, indicates that you have internalized your programming. I would agree with your Attorney, maybe it's a function of age at 77. Um, you're not always able to articulate or express your feelings exactly, there were several times today you were searching for words, um, but we do look at the conduct and we do look at, as I said, letters from people that have seen you on a day-to-day basis and we take that into consideration along with the work that you've done and the discipline-free record that you have. So, all of that shows us that there is offender change and that it has been, um, ongoing. We're all a work in process. Transformation doesn't happen overnight. We also found your parole plans to be adequate. You have someone out there with housing that's being offered in your brother, even to the extent that he would assist you if SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 19

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you were deported, um, and that's always one of the major concerns are housing and financial support. It sounds like he has that. That said, we also believe that after 50 something years, you can't not be institutionalized and we believe that there should be some structured setting. We would certainly leave it -- leave it up to parole to ensure your safety wherever it is that you are placed, but that'll be one of the special conditions as well. We also believe that you have a support network. While you only have the one brother left, there are obviously people on this call and others that have pledged their support to you. Um, it appears that you also may have the ability to create a support network in your faith community once you're, um, released. And so, we find that your plans subsequent to release are mitigating, parole plans and support network. And then that brings us to the Risk Assessments, not only in 2020 by Dr. Cirimele wherein it is opined that you are a low risk for violence, but there's also a 2016 report by Dr. Sahni, S-A-H-N-I, and a 2010 report by Dr. Carrera, C-A-R-R-E-R-A, not -- not leaving out the private reports that have been, um, prepared by others on your behest, but even leaving those out, and they of course are both positive as well, these are three expert forensic psychologists who work on behalf SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 20

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of the Board to prepare these assessments. And while they are not certainly the end-all, many times I have given things different weight than what they've given things. But when I read through them all, there was one sort of central theme that I saw and that is even recognizing that you don't take complete responsibility for the actions, even recognizing that your insight has been poor at times with them, and that your answers to them have not always been direct and they've even described you as evasive, nevertheless, notwithstanding those issues, they've all still come to the conclusion overall that you were a low risk and that's for a lifer inmate. And not to necessarily, um, take issue with Ms. Abreu, but I can tell you that in the last 10 years the overall recidivism rate for California prisoners has dropped from 65 to 45% in a large part my belief is because we've re-instituted rehabilitation into the prisons. But that's for general determinately sentenced inmates. Lifers, somewhere between 8 and 10,000 now that have been released have recidivated at less than a 1.5 to 2% rate. And what these ratings are indicating is that you are considered by all three of these expert psychologists, to be at the low end of a 1.5 or 2% recidivism rate. So, it is significantly lower than the average recidivism rate for an average person being SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 21

2

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

released from prison and there are a lot of reasons for that, obviously given people aging out of crime, people having more time and more motivation to program. And there are some programs I don't think you can help but learn something about yourself even if you're just sitting in the chair. So, we find that the Risk Assessment, the current Risk Assessment as well as the two priors, support this decision. And then we get to, um, mental health issues. You're not currently diagnosed with anything on the DSM-5 as far as a major mental, uh, disorder. However, because there was mention of, you know, your impact of your childhood and your Attorney certainly mentioned it as posttraumatic stress syndrome, which we know can stay repressed for many years and impact people differently, depending on what triggers arise, we're also going to order as a special condition that you take part in what we call BHRP, which is Behavioral Health Reintegration Program, it used to be called Parole Outpatient Counseling, but I'll get to that when we get to special conditions. So, in case someone is checking boxes, we find mitigating your offender control, mitigating your, uh, prior criminal or lack thereof history, mitigating institutional adjustment, mitigating an offender change, mitigating in parole plans, mitigating for programming. SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 22

2

3

5

ĸ

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And now we get to spa -- what we call case specific factors, the first one of which is what we call the youth offender factors. And this is important because if we were on the fence again, in terms of the impact of the crime and lack of responsibility, this factor in my opinion would cause us to still, and looking at the scales, um, give benefit to the inmate who qualifies as a youth offender. Basically, what science indicates at this time is that at that age our brains are not fully mature. Now you were probably at the upper end at 24, as opposed to a 16-year-old, but nevertheless, when I talked to you about where you at in your life, you were aimless. No doubt you had some emotional growth stunted as a result of your childhood experiences and the fact that that was ongoing and I -- I quite frankly think that you still need to explore that because even though you said you didn't seek it out, it wasn't like you were looking for it, I think that you had to have been keenly aware of it because of how it impacted you, and certainly in your actions on the day of the shooting. So, but when we look at that, we look at overall, if those executive order functions are not fully mature, what does that do to the individual? And in your case, it's subjected you to basically immature thinking, certainly bad judgment as we talked about, SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 23

2

3

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

having a gun when you're inebriated. You also didn't weigh the long-term consequences of your actions. You were impulsive. Um, there's even a section in the law that talks about having a general mistrust and reluctance to trust your Attorney resulting in working less effectively with your Attorney and aiding in your defense. In your case, it sort of turned on its ear a little bit in that at least it's been represented that you may have trusted your Attorney too much and not been able to effectively aid in your defense, but it still falls under that rubric of someone who's 24, who has not been exposed to the criminal justice system. And then we look at all the other hallmark features of youth, and you demonstrated what we call an underdeveloped understanding of your responsibility for your actions and decisions and you demonstrated impetuous thinking. At some point, in my mind, regardless of how many drinks you had, you had to make a conscious choice to pull that gun out and pull the trigger and in doing so, whether inebriated or not, in my mind there had to have been for most of us, you know, some thought process that proceeds that because your hand usually doesn't work on its own. That said, your thought process, by virtue of being a youthful offender, demonstrated significant heedless appreciation of the consequences of your action. SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 24

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In other words, it was very impetuous. It was very impulsive. You didn't think about what was gonna happen to the people that were shot, what was gonna happen to you, what was gonna happen to the nation, what was gonna happen to the world. I doubt any of that was gone through in your mind ahead of doing what you did. So as a youth offender, we have to look at whether or not you were capable of change, or whether this evidenced what we call a depraved character, in other words, entrenched criminality. And oftentimes we see people come to prison and they get worse. They join gangs, they commit perhaps even more horrific crimes in prison than they did when they came. That wasn't the case for you. We saw someone who, I think you were immature in the 70s, that certainly shown by the 115's that you got then and some of the verbal outbursts that you were, uh, making. Um, but I think that if, you know, you came in at 24 and by the time you were basically in your late 30s, certainly through your 40s and beyond, um, you showed considerable maturity in avoiding situations. As I said, I am keenly, maybe uniquely, other than perhaps some of our Wardens that are on the Board that understand what happens in prisons, aware of how difficult it is to live in that environment, especially being someone with high notoriety and avoid problems. So SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

we recognize that in doing so, you had to exercise good judgment on a daily basis and it appears again from the laudatory chronos that you received that you did. And then as I said, in the last five years, we felt that you've engaged in more reflection and made a significant attempt to think about the reasons and the impact of your actions. You demonstrated maturity through impulse control, developed prosocial relationships, stayed away from negative influences, and it's resulted in all the positive programming, the positive job reports, the -- the positive, uh, letters of support from officers, certainly the programming and results of that programming. So, under the youth offender factors and giving great weight to those factors, um, we felt that that is significant mitigation as well, that hasn't existed previously in your hearings. And then finally we gave special consideration and considered to be mitigating your age of 77, the various health concerns that you have, I'm not gonna reiterate them, they're already in the record. Um, and obviously I don't wish this upon anyone, but you're going to continue to age and -- and that debilitation will only increase, we don't see it as something that gets better necessarily. So, we determined that those, that factor also reduced your risk for future violence, uh, age, and SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 26

certainly the time that you served and the injuries that 1 you've suffered, uh, even most recently is something that 2 has additionally resulted in debilitation, at least in 3 terms of your, uh, neck and then we know about the shoulder and the kidneys and those issues. Overall, we 5 look at, uh, these decisions, as I said, judicial 6 officers, and when they're examined, we are mindful of the 7 case law. We're mindful of Shaputis 2, in re Bush, in re Rodriguez, all of which are contrary perhaps to your 9 Counsel's arguments, um, would in the past have found an 10 implausible denial along with attendant, lack of 11 responsibility or insight, along with the aggravating 12 nature of the crime, to be sufficient, uh, to deny you. 13 However, we did consider all of those things. And in 14 15 considering those things, we saw the improvement that you've made and all of the other mitigating factors and we 16 did not find that your lack of taking complete 17 responsibility adds to current dangerousness. Based on 18 these findings, we conclude that you do not pose an 19 unreasonable risk of danger or threat to public safety and 20 are finding you suitable. This decision is not final. You 21 need to understand the Governor has discretion to be more 22 23 stringent or cautious in determining whether someone poses an unreasonable risk to public safety and courts give much 24 25 SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 27

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

deference to the executive function. But as far as our decision within the law and the evidence that we are bound to follow today as judicial officers, we are finding that you are suitable. However, it will be reviewed. The Board's legal team reviews this decision, that takes up to 120 days. The Governor has an additional 30 days to review it. If something changes, you'd be notified in writing of what that is, The Governor can reverse it and the Governor can send it back to the entire Board, the other 16 Commissioners would then review the entire file. They would not like me very much at that point probably, but they would all do it and all of my colleagues are, um, certainly, uh, in -- in my opinion, I know that past Boards, through no personal intent have been disparaged for their decisions or in some of the filings I saw that they were, um, ascribed ill-intent, that they were making their decisions just to reach a particular conclusion and looking for any reason to do that. I have faith in my fellow colleagues in their commitment to this job and their commitment to doing what the appropriate thing is in every case and treating every individual fairly. So, if it, uh, ends up being that their review, I have every confidence that they will do so and they may disagree with me, but I also believe that they are all fair men and SIRHAN SIRHAN B21014 8/27/2021 DECISION PAGE 28

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

further. Thank you.

women who take this job as seriously as I do. That said, the reason that I'm saying this is, I want you to know that for the next four to five months, until whatever happens happens, you need to remain in your program, whatever it is that you're doing, being on the job, staying out of trouble, because even the slightest misstep on your part, even a counseling chrono for putting up a window covering or something that shows additional recalcitrance or disrespect for authority could be enough to have your grant rescinded. So that's why I'm trying to make that clear to you. If you are released from prison, you're gonna be subject to all the general conditions of parole as well as the special conditions that I'm going to impose in a moment. But before I do that, I have to ask Commissioner Meighan, if she concurs and if she wants to add to the decision. Commissioner. DEPUTY COMMISSIONER MEIGHAN: Concur. Nothing