

**INDETERMINATE SENTENCE PAROLE RELEASE REVIEW  
REQUEST FOR EN BANC REVIEW**  
(Penal Code Section 3041.1)

**PATRICK GOODMAN, T-65913**

Assaulting a Child Causing Death

**CRIME**

In 2000, Patrick Goodman attacked his girlfriend's three-year-old son, slamming him against the wall and striking him more than 50 times. The child died from his extensive injuries.

**STATEMENT OF REASONS**

A jury convicted Mr. Goodman of both second degree murder and assault resulting the death of a child under eight years old. The sentencing court stayed the murder charge pursuant to Penal Code section 654 and sentenced Mr. Goodman to a 25-years-to life term for the charge of assault causing the death of a child.

Under the California Constitution, the Governor's authority to reverse a grant of parole is limited only to "a person sentenced to an indeterminate term upon conviction of murder." Cal. Const., art. V, section 8(b); see also Cal. Penal Code section 3041.2. Mr. Goodman's commitment offense (assault resulting the death of a child under eight years old) is not classified as murder under California law. See *People v. Malfavon*, 102 Cal.App.4th 727, 741 (2002). Accordingly, pursuant to Penal Code section 3041.1, I have the authority only to affirm the Board's recommended parole grant or refer Mr. Goodman's case back to the Board for en banc review. If I had the legal authority to reverse Mr. Goodman's parole grant, I would do so, for the reasons detailed below.

As required by law, I have reviewed all the records in this case, including Mr. Goodman's rehabilitative efforts and conduct in prison. I acknowledge that he has participated in targeted self-help programming to address his risk factors, earned his GED, completed vocational training, and maintained a positive employment record. I note that in the parole process, he has expressed remorse and taken some accountability for the crime, which is a critical development given that, at the time of his trial, he not only denied his culpability but also shifted blame to the victim's mother.

However, I have also weighed the other factors in this case that indicate he remains unsuitable for parole at this time. I ask the full Board to review this case

and determine whether the panel's recommended parole grant was provident and consistent with public safety.

Specifically, I am concerned that Mr. Goodman has not sufficiently mitigated his risk factors for family violence and his triggers for violent responses to stressors. Although he now admits to committing the life crime, the evaluating psychologist found that there remain gaps in Mr. Goodman's self-awareness, including "the extent of damage he inflicted upon [the victim] during the life crime." Mr. Goodman was unable, for example, to explain how the victim suffered a broken wrist. Mr. Goodman's apparent inability to confront and accept the full extent of the physical abuse he inflicted on the victim raises serious questions about his rehabilitative progress, including whether he is sufficiently aware of the extent to which he is capable of such serious violence or his potential triggers to prevent a recurrence of it.

I also find that Mr. Goodman has not developed adequate coping skills to form and maintain healthy relationships in the community. While Mr. Goodman denies physically abusing his intimate partners, he admits he abused them verbally, emotionally, and financially. At his hearing, Mr. Goodman told the commissioners that, at the time of the life crime, he had a strong sense of entitlement and acted out violently when things did not go his way. He attributed his actions during the life crime to situational stressors, noting that at the time of the crime he had recently discontinued drug dealing, was in financial distress, and was experiencing increased dissatisfaction with his life overall. This explanation does not account for Mr. Goodman's failure to manage his internal responses to external factors that led to the brutal assault of a defenseless child.

If he is released on parole, he will likely face significant stressors, including those resulting from the notoriety of his crime. Before he can safely parole, he must demonstrate that he has the insight and self-awareness of the factors that trigger his rage and violence, and that he has mastered the skills he will need to manage them.

**CONCLUSION**

For these reasons, I refer the decision to parole Mr. Goodman back to the Board for *en banc* consideration.

Decision Date:  
March 29, 2024



---

GAVIN NEWSOM  
Governor, State of California