"PICKLE-BARREL Or 'Parole'Board: Ya' Cain't Tell What's IN It 'Til Ya' **Git The LID Off'n It !**"

That's the trouble with pickle-barrels: we mostly leave 'em to do their work, down in some dark basement, never lifting the lid to check the progress. 'Til we do we WON'T know what's IN there....could be a mess; (might be a mess o' SKUNKS !!)

For the past 16 years nobody has actually <u>lifted the</u> <u>'lid'off</u> the (Ohio) 'parole' board, and (Whoops!...<u>WHAT</u> a mess !!) SOMEBODY 'botched-the-batch', and now thousands of "Old Law" 'pickles' are 'way YONDER past their 'prime' (their <u>legitimate</u> sentences, that is).

"Okay, so just exactly WHAT IS the "legitimate" "Old-Law" sentence !?"

For those not yet "in-the-know", Historically it lies <u>between</u> the 'minimum' (yes, the <u>ACTUAL</u> sentence !) and <u>2/3</u> <u>of</u> the same, to <u>encourage</u> 'good behavior'. (Examples: "5-to-25" <u>means</u> "You do 3 1/2-to-5 but NOT MORE than 5;" By the same formula, "10-to-25" <u>means</u> "You do 7-to-10 years but NOT MORE than 10.")

THAT is WHY the Judge said "Behave yourself and you'll be FINISHED in 3 1/2 !" ((or: "Watch your step, and you'll be OUT in 7 years!").

In other words, the 'parole' board were empowered to <u>LESSEN</u> a sentence for good behavior. But they were NOT EVER to <u>increase</u> it, as they <u>are not</u> a COURT and therefore <u>have</u> no sentencing-power!

The "25" ("tail") common to ALL 'Felony-1' sentences was intended by Lawmakers as a 'scare-tactic' to prevent recidivism - to make <u>parolees</u> "walk-the-line." It was, of course, never really meant to be "served" but to be "held over their heads."

BUT the 'board' (and ONLY the 'board') want us to believe that the "25" (the "tail") was the "real" 'sentence.'

"PICKLE-BARREL"....

Anything LESS THAN "25" the 'board' glibly refers to as "early release", just as if they DIDN'T KNOW that virtually every "Old Law" person is by now 10 or 15 or 20 years PAST the possibility of "early" ANYTHING!

But YOU get the picture

So.... WHAT to do NOW ?...

First off: DON'T LET IT GO ANY FURTHER! <u>Insist</u> that Authorities step in <u>NOW</u> and <u>take</u> <u>away</u> the 'board's' control over "Old Law" people.

Then: Request that the Governor appoint several retired Judges and assign to each of them a handful of skilled assistants. <u>Within a week or so</u> they ought to be able to <u>identify</u> <u>and release</u> whoever of the remaining "Old Law" have had the required "statutory first parole-hearing"....

NOTE: To those concerned about further "monitoring": As for "parole," anyone who is, say, 10 years <u>past</u> eligibility has, technically, ALREADY SERVED the <u>equivalent of FIVE two-</u> <u>year paroles</u> ($10 \div 2 = 5$). So <u>what more</u> should we <u>require</u> of him in the way of "proof" ? Has he not "supervised" <u>HIMSELF</u>, in that he has kept out of trouble all of that time, and in a place where doing so cannot be easy !?

Was it Calvin Coolidge who said that "Nine-out-of-ten troubles coming down the road will run into the ditch before they get to you." ? So why worry ?!

No doubt at all that a FAR greater per-centage of "Old Law," once let go, will STAY ON the Straight-And-Narrow, whether "supervised" or ON THEIR OWN.

by Raedwulf

11 (of 11)