

JUD Receptionist

From: Jacob Wourms <jacob@campaignzero.org>
Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2025 8:00 AM
Cc: DeRay Mckesson
Subject: Parole | HB1147 & HB1156

Good morning, Members of the Judiciary Committee,

I help lead Campaign Zero's work on parole -- thank you for allowing DeRay Mckesson, our Executive Director, to testify last week regarding house bills 1147 and 1156. We've done a lot of work comparing the two bills to nationwide parole precedent / standards. Our review, which includes a [two-minute video](#) alongside more in-depth analysis of both bills, is available at our website: MDParole.com.

As DeRay stated in his testimony, the reason an established cadence / automatic schedule for parole hearings is so important (HB1147) is that the Maryland Parole Commission currently refuses over a thousand applications for parole hearings every year (these aren't denials of parole, they're denials of a *hearing*). The legislature has made the offenses parole-eligible, judges have given these people a parole-eligible sentence, and then the Commission overrules both and refuses to consider them. Only three other states (DE, ID, UT) require a person to request a parole hearing.

During the opponents' testimony, Mr. Cluster said multiple times that he didn't know where DeRay got these refusal numbers from and insisted it doesn't happen. Please reference this [public records request](#), made to DPSCS in January, that includes the number of parole refusals for 2023 (1,126 hearing refusals) and 2024 (1,159 hearing refusals). The relevant file name is "PIA 56193 Results."

If you have any other questions about DeRay's testimony, our analysis, or how these two bills compare nationally, let's schedule a time to talk more. We're eager to help.

Gratefully,
Jacob

Jacob Wourms (he/him/his)
Research & Campaign Manager, Programs

campaignzero.org

