

LFC Requester:	
-----------------------	--

**AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS
2026 REGULAR SESSION**

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO:

AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov

{Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF}

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}

Check all that apply:

Original **Amendment**
Correction **Substitute**

Date 1/27/2026

Bill No: SB 43-280

Sponsor: Leo Jaramillo
Short Title: Parole Requirement Changes

Agency Name and Code LOPD-280
Number: _____
Person Writing Tania Shahani
Phone: 505 395 2890 **Email** Tania.Shahani@lopdm.us

SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropriation		Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY25	FY26		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY25	FY26	FY27		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY25	FY26	FY27	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total						

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:
Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis:

SB 43 would amend NMSA 1978, Section 31-21-10 to clarify and organize the factors the Parole Board must consider when determining whether to grant parole to an individual serving a life sentence after thirty years of incarceration.

The proposed bill emphasizes that parole consideration should focus on an inmate’s risk and readiness for release, including institutional behavior, participation in rehabilitative programming, and demonstrated maturity and rehabilitation. It also reorganizes the list of information the Board must consider and removes some duplicative language. In addition, SB 43 would update provisions related to Parole Board compensation and clarifies hearing scheduling practices in homicide cases.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

SB 43 wouldn’t change parole eligibility dates or expand the class of individuals eligible for parole. Instead, it clarifies and reorganizes the statutory factors the Parole Board must consider when evaluating parole for individuals sentenced to life imprisonment after thirty years.

LOPD does not represent inmates in life sentence parole hearings. However, when issues arise from such hearings, LOPD does occasionally provide habeas corpus representation. Because the bill does not increase the number of parole hearings or mandate release, LOPD does not anticipate a direct or immediate fiscal impact on indigent defense budgets. Any fiscal effect would be indirect and speculative. The Parole Board could see increased fiscal efficiency arising from improved preparation (more inmates meeting expectations and thus qualifying for parole) and thus a reduction in the number of parole hearings per inmate over time.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

SB 43 may improve the efficiency of parole hearings by helping incarcerated individuals focus preparation on clearly articulated statutory factors. Clear expectations may lead to more relevant presentations at hearings and reduce uncertainty for both applicants and the Board.

In practice, individuals serving life sentences are rarely granted parole at their first eligibility hearing after thirty years. That initial hearing often functions as an informational benchmark,

where the individual learns what specific factors the Parole Board expects to see before parole will be granted. Many individuals are therefore more meaningfully prepared when they return for a subsequent hearing two years later. By clarifying the parole factors in the statute, SB 43 may help incarcerated individuals better understand the expectations of the Parole Board before their first hearing. Clear statutory guidance may allow individuals to prepare more effectively for parole consideration at the thirty-year mark, rather than learning the criteria only after an initial denial.

More broadly, articulating the relevant factors in the statute would allow for greater consistency and equity in parole decision-making and provide clearer notice of what is expected of individuals seeking parole. Increased transparency in the parole process may improve confidence in outcomes without altering the Board's discretion or public-safety role.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

TECHNICAL ISSUES

Analyst is unaware whether this legislation is germane under Art. IV, Section 5. It is not a budget bill and analyst is unaware that it has been drawn pursuant to a special message of the Governor.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

AMENDMENTS