

TO] MEMBERS OF THE MEDIA

FR] Luis Perez - No. W33937
N.C.C.I. - GARDNER
P.O. Box 466
Gardner, Mass. 01440

RE] Juvenile Justice - Equal Protection

DT] July/ 10, 2012

The most recent ruling by the United States Supreme Court will affect many JUVENILES who are serving "Life Sentences Without Parole" in Massachusetts, while on the other hand it will create a conflict for those individuals who were considered minors under 21 years of age back in the 1960's and 1970's.

I'm working on a Habeas Corpus to challenge the law and the application of the ruling in Massachusetts based on **AGE DISCRIMINATION** violating the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution and Article 12 of the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights.

The question is very simple, "How can you give a different sentence to minors under 18 years old and another sentence to individuals as minors under 21 years old" - In particular when both groups have been convicted under the same sentence M.G.L. Ch. 256 § 1, & 2.

For those who are reading my web-page, I want you to know that I fought the same issues when Governor Weld signed the COPNEY-GRANT ACT on 12/31/1991. - By the time the appeal was under way in Federal Court, the COPNEY-GRANT ACT was repealed by the State and the entire issue was moot.



I was convicted on a JOINT VENTURE MUDER STATUTES, I am the only one who is serving time in prison since (1971). - One of my co-defendant's pleaded guilty to second degree murder and received a Six-Year term of probation despite the mandate of life sentence pursuant to MGL C. 265 §2. Something that can't be done on the statute - but, he made a deal with the D.A. and the Court allowing him to saying that I shot the victim at close range in the head, when in fact the Pathology Report indicated very clear that there was no gun powder burn on the victim's skin.

I am hoping that somehow the State Court reviews this matter and allows me some abjustment on my life sentence. - Massachusetts has tendency to apply the law differently unequally to different classes of people. It is my believe that in reading the RULES OF CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (Rule 25 (b) 1 and 2, The Judge acting under his power should be guided by same considerations used by Supreme Judicial Court especial power GL c. 278 §33E to reduce verdic.

In the Struggle,

Luis D. Perez

www.betweenthebars.org./blog/350