

nf7c

August 19, 2020

Dear Julia,

No worries! I will explore possible legal challenges to the unfair parole denial, which in my opinion was a case study in anti-trans bias and U.S. political prisoner repression. For example, the BPH Comprehensive Risk Assessment (CRA), which admittedly included factual errors and "anti-trans bias", which the BPH partially corrected and excused as psychologist "opinions" by BPH Forensic Psychologist S. Hoyt which were made permissible by the suggestion that I could object or refute them at hearing. Additionally, they apparently issued "confidential information" and a revised CRA as evidence, which I wasn't provided disclosure of or allowed to object and refute at the hearing under threat of being removed from the hearing unless I "shut up" in the words of the Commissioner Maria Gutierrez.

In any case, my state appointed attorney Richard Rutledge, Esq. of Rutledge and

Associates, in Aptos, California, was not much help either. Not only did he not help me prepare, he misled me to simply "hold" all my documentary evidence until the day of my hearing. However, he failed to inform me of a 21 page limit on "day of hearing" document inclusion, which led to much of my supporting evidence to be excluded and the support letters or certificates I was able to have included was simply discounted and left unread by the BPH panel!

The panel recommendation were that I get "no more 115's or 128A's" (disciplinary rule-violations); "work to reduce custody level; stay discipline free; Earn positive chrono's". Also, "As Available: Get self-help; Learn a trade." Unfortunately, due to the COVID-19 shut down, such self-help and vocational programs have not been available in the prisons since March 2020, and won't be for the foreseeable future — which is indefinitely! Wish me luck!

— Jennifer Rose