



Written Testimony of Daniel Landsman
Vice President of Policy, FAMM
RE: Advisory Letter 2025-01
Interim Courts, Corrections, and Justice Committee
November 6, 2025

Chair Cervantes, Vice Chair Chandler and members of the Interim Courts, Corrections, and Justice Committee – thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony regarding FAMM’s concerns with Advisory Letter 2025-01 from Attorney General Raul Torrez and its potential impact on people currently on parole under the process enacted by the legislature in 2023 through SB 64.

FAMM has significant concerns with Attorney General Torrez’s conclusion regarding people serving consecutive sentences for a single case under NMSA Section 31-21-10.2. Having been involved in the advocacy behind SB 64, the intent of the legislation was clear: Give people serving significant prison sentences for crimes committed before their 18th birthday an opportunity for *release from prison* through parole after 15, 20, or 25 years.

The Attorney General’s advisory letter states that Section 31-21-10.2 “specifically states” that an individual with consecutive sentences is “merely paroled to begin service of their next consecutive sentence”. However, the opposite is true. The statute states, “Parole eligibility and a parole hearing shall occur whether the offender is serving concurrent or consecutive sentences for multiple convictions arising from the *same* case.” In a separate sentence, the statute mentions such a system as described the Attorney General for people with consecutive sentences from *multiple* eligible cases. The statute does not establish such a system for people with consecutive sentences from the same case. The conclusion of Advisory Letter 2025-01 flies in the face of the bill’s language, intent, and context.

The threat of return to prison is resulting in significant trauma and hardship for those released under this law and who have remained compliant with the conditions of their parole, as well as their families, friends, and community members. The text and intent of SB 64 is clear – returning a person currently, and successfully, on parole because of a misreading of the bill would be an affront to the legislature and the rights and dignity of those home and following the conditions of their supervision.