

July 4, 2000

Lawrence Jones, Executive Director
David Cooper, Chair
Mary Ann Eininger, Vice Chair
Charles Moses, Member
Mike Miller, Member

Alaska State Board of Parole
PO Box 112000
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Dear Parole Board Members,

I am writing this letter to request re-consideration of your prior decision, and denial, of Anthony (Tony) Lee Brown's parole request.

I do realize parole matters have many elements that need serious consideration and present a grave responsibility for the members of the parole board. Serious consideration has to be given to safety matters and the community's protection. In Tony's case, I ask that you give serious reflection to his 24 years of incarceration and look at his record of behavior. Not once has he ever reacted in a violent or threatening manner to anyone. He did at one time put himself between a hostile prisoner and a prison guard, an action for which he was given a commendation, which should be in his parole file, as it was presented for evidence of his change in character back in 1991, when he first went before the parole board.

I personally met with the District Attorney, Harry Davis, on June 19, 2000, the district attorney who prosecuted Tony's case. Mr. Davis stated to me that he had no knowledge of any threats from Tony. Not back in the days when he was prosecuting the case, or in recent times. I believe, that if you listen to the recording of the parole board hearing on June 1st, you will find that Ms. Fischer stated during that hearing that she had been in touch with Mr. Davis, and he had told her of Tony's threats. That statement is absolutely erroneous, according to Mr. Davis himself. Mr. Davis also stated that back when Tony was originally arrested, there were other similar crimes they initially suspected Tony of, due to the nature of the crime he had been involved in, but there was no evidence that Tony was involved in them and if there had been evidence to indicate that, he certainly would have prosecuted him.

Until this came up recently, Tony stated he did not realize that there had been any other real crimes he was suspect in back in 1976, and he had thought perhaps it had been idle imaginings that the family of his victim had in their minds because of publicity that had been printed in the newspapers back during the trial. Tony has had me inform Mr. Davis that he is willing to give hair, blood, DNA or anything that could be compared with any evidence from any crimes that may not have been solved. Tony is also willing to take a polygraph test. I left this offer in form of a letter for Mr. Davis, when he was in a meeting and unable to meet with me the second time I went to the District Attorney's office on June 24th, 2000.

Ex. 10, pg. 1 of 2

In your reply to Tony you stated that release at this time would, in some way diminish the gravity of the crime, yet many individuals are released for the same crime, with much less time served. Even with less evidence of change in their behavior. It has always been my understanding that parole is a mechanism used to return individuals to the community once they demonstrate they are no longer a threat to the community. If this understanding is correct, I believe that Tony has demonstrated his change in character. His institutional record reflects this, as well as his having completed every program available to him. Up to the point that Ms. Fischer spoke to the victim's family, Ms. Fischer felt the same way, which was reflected in her initial recommendation endorsing Tony as a good candidate for parole. Ms. Fischer also felt strongly enough in Tony's character that she had him work with the close-up project in Juneau as an example of how people can change.

I can understand Eric Christensen's family and their quest for revenge. I am concerned about Ms. Fischer, who is employed to work with prisoners and assist in their development, who would ask a prisoner to assist with the close-up program and give Tony assistance in working towards meeting with the parole board, who would at the last minute, take erroneous information and statements out of context, to twist their meanings and use that against the prisoner she is working with. If Ms. Fisher had believed Tony was a threat to the community, or herself for that matter, prior to her contact with the victim's family, she would not have needed to change her recommendation four days prior to the original parole board hearing.

The fact that Ms. Fischer stated that she had been in contact with Mr. Davis and had been told by him of Tony's threats, should give the Parole Board serious concern as to her lack of objectivity, and to the power that is given to her. It is my understanding that as a parole officer she is supposed to evaluate inmates and their character, skills and ability in relation to how, and when they are ready to become productive within mainstream society. Her job is not to become so personally involved with the victim's family that she can no longer offer objective recommendations and evaluations.

In light of the above, I humbly request that the Board reconsider their decision of Tony's application for parole, based upon his behaviors and documented progress over the past 24 years. If the court would have felt Tony incapable of making the necessary changes to re-enter society as a productive member, it would have made certain that his sentences ran consecutively, instead of concurrently, as well as without the possibility of parole. I ask that you not judge Tony based upon the erroneous imaginings of others.

Respectfully Submitted,

Loretta M. Beaver

Loretta M. Beaver
Anthony Lee Brown's Mother

cc: Margaret Pugh, Commissioner of Corrections
Vance A. Sanders, Esq.
File

Ex. 10, pg. 2 of 2