

White, Andrew R.

From: sarah sugden <sarahsugden77@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 05, 2026 7:01 AM
To: sctclerk@mssc.state.ms.us
Subject: Carly Gregg 2024-KA-01178-SCT

ORIGINAL

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Some people who received this message don't often get email from sarahsugden77@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL EMAIL

To the Honorable Justices of the Mississippi Supreme Court

FILED

Re: Carly Madison Gregg — No. 2024-KA-01178-SCT
Support for Motion for Rehearing

OCT 05 2026

OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT
COURT OF APPEALS

Dear Chief Justice and Honorable Justices,

I respectfully write in support of Carly Madison Gregg and her attorneys' Motion for Rehearing.

I understand that this Court's August 20, 2026 opinion affirmed Carly's convictions and sentences, while also making an important distinction regarding the sentence imposed upon her. The Court determined that Carly received life imprisonment, rather than a sentence of life imprisonment without eligibility for parole.

That distinction now has significant practical consequences.

The concern is that, despite the Court's determination, Carly's records within the Mississippi Department of Corrections reportedly continue to identify her as ineligible for parole. WLBT reported on September 29, 2026, that MDOC records still reflected that classification and that the Department had not received a directive from the Court requiring a change.

This creates an apparent gap between what the Court has determined and how Carly's sentence is currently being administered.

Carly's attorneys have already brought this matter directly to the Court through their September 17 Motion for Rehearing, seeking clarification and an enforceable mandate concerning her parole eligibility. I respectfully ask the Court to give that request serious consideration.

The issue is not one of asking Carly to receive preferential treatment. It is about ensuring that the sentence imposed upon her, and subsequently interpreted by this Court, is accurately and consistently reflected by the agency responsible for carrying it out.

Where an individual remains classified according to an interpretation that appears inconsistent with the Court's stated determination, uncertainty can have very real consequences. In Carly's case, that uncertainty concerns something as fundamental as whether she is legally eligible for parole.

The Court has already addressed the distinction between a sentence of life imprisonment and life imprisonment without eligibility for parole. If the Court's conclusion is that Carly's sentence falls within the former category, then clear instructions may be necessary to ensure that conclusion is properly implemented.

I therefore respectfully ask the Court, in considering the Motion for Rehearing, to clarify its ruling and mandate in a manner that leaves no uncertainty regarding Carly's parole eligibility and, where legally appropriate, directs the necessary correction of her MDOC classification and records.

It is important that there be consistency between the judgment of the Court and the records relied upon by the state agency responsible for administering that judgment.

I respectfully thank the Court for considering this matter and for the care given to Carly's case.

Respectfully,

Sarah Sugden

A supporter of Carly Madison Gregg