

- People who are criminalized survivors;
- People who were 17 years of age or younger at the time of the offense and were prosecuted as an adult.

In formulating this policy, we rely on current statistical data from the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR). (See Appendix.) Over time, the data may be subject to change; the urgency of our mission will not be. In seeking resentencing under 1170(d)(1), this Office shall argue that resentencing is necessary to eliminate disparity of sentences and to promote uniformity of sentencing.

At all types of resentencing hearings, filing deputies shall assist the Resentencing Court by setting forth any and all postconviction factors that support resentencing, including, but not limited to: mitigation evidence; CDCR disciplinary records and record of rehabilitation and positive programming while incarcerated; evidence that reflects whether age, time served, and diminished physical condition, if any, have reduced the risk for future violence; evidence that reflects that circumstances have changed since the original sentencing so that continued incarceration is no longer in the interest of justice; and post-release reentry plans, demonstrating any family or community support that is available upon release. (See e.g. Assembly Bill 1812, Pen. Code § 1170, subd. (d).)

LIFER PAROLE HEARINGS

This Office recognizes that parole is an effective process to reduce recidivism, ensure public safety, and assist people in successfully rejoining society. The CDCR's own statistics show that people paroled from life terms have a recidivism rate of less than four percent.

We are not experts on rehabilitation. While we have information about the crime of conviction, the Board of Parole Hearings already has this information. Further, as the crime of conviction is of limited value in considering parole suitability years or decades later, (see *In re Lawrence* (2008) 44 Cal.4th 1181; *In re Shaputis* (2008) 44 Cal. 4th 1241, 1255), the value of a prosecutor's input in parole hearings is also limited. Finally, pursuant to Penal Code section 3041, there is a presumption that people shall be released on parole upon reaching the Minimum Eligible Parole Date (MEPD), their Youth Parole Eligible Date, (YEPD), or their Elderly Parole Date (EPD). Currently, sentences are being served that are much longer than the already lengthy mandatory minimum sentences imposed. Such sentences are constitutionally excessive. (See *In re Palmer* (2019) 33 Cal.App.5th 1199.)

This Office's default policy is that we will not attend parole hearings and will support in writing the grant of parole for a person who has already served their mandatory minimum period of incarceration, defined as their MEPD, YEPD or EPD. However, if the CDCR has determined in their Comprehensive Risk Assessment that a person represents a "high" risk for recidivism, the DDA may, in their letter, take a neutral position on the grant of parole.

This Office will continue to meet its obligation to notify and advise victims under California law, and is committed to a process of healing and restorative justice for all victims.