White, Andrew R.

From: Stephanie Gilby <stephiegilby96@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 01, 2026 11:34 AM
To: sctclerk@mssc.state.ms.us
Subject: Support for Oral Rehearing – Carly Madison Gregg | Case No. 2024-KA-01178-SCT

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

ORIGINAL

Some people who received this message don't often get email from stephiegilby96@gmail.com. Learn why this is important

EXTERNAL EMAIL

FILED
NOV 01 2026
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT
COURT OF APPEALS

Dear Honourable Justices of the Mississippi Supreme Court,

My name is Stephanie Gilby, and I am writing from England to express my support for the request for an oral rehearing in the case of Carly Madison Gregg.

I appreciate that this case concerns a terrible loss of life and has caused immeasurable pain to those affected. I do not wish to minimise the seriousness of the offences or the suffering of the victims' loved ones.

My concern is that Carly was only 14 years old when these events occurred, and I believe every aspect of her trial, sentencing and future parole eligibility deserves the closest possible scrutiny.

1. The urgent need to correct Carly's parole status

The issue that concerns me most is the reported discrepancy between the Mississippi Supreme Court's ruling and the records maintained by the Mississippi Department of Corrections (MDOC).

My understanding is that the Supreme Court clarified in its decision of 20 August 2026 that Carly's life sentences were not sentences of life without the possibility of parole.

Despite this, it has been reported that MDOC continued to classify her as ineligible for parole because it had not received the formal notification necessary to change her records.

If that position remains unresolved, it raises a serious concern about whether the Court's decision is being given practical effect.

A judicial ruling should not leave a person serving a sentence under an inaccurate correctional classification.

I respectfully request that the Court issue a specific written directive, through whatever procedure is legally appropriate, requiring MDOC to amend Carly's official records to reflect the correct sentence.

This should include formal confirmation of her parole-eligible status, the applicable statutory minimum period she must serve and the earliest date on which she may lawfully be considered for parole.

I am not asking for Carly to be released immediately or for any guarantee that parole will eventually be granted.

I am asking that the opportunity to be considered for parole, if provided by law, is clearly recognised and not lost through an administrative failure.

2. A definite minimum period before parole consideration

I believe it is essential that Carly's sentence has a clear and legally established meaning.

If she is eligible for parole, the minimum period required before consideration should be identified, calculated and entered into her official records.

A young person sentenced to life imprisonment should not face uncertainty about whether she will ever have the opportunity to demonstrate rehabilitation.

Carly was 14 at the time of the offences. She will continue to develop emotionally, psychologically and intellectually throughout her years in custody.

Her future eligibility for parole would allow the relevant authorities to assess her progress, conduct, maturity and risk at the appropriate time.

That opportunity is not the same as forgiveness or automatic release. It is a recognition that a child may be capable of substantial change.

3. The speed of the proceedings and sentencing

Another aspect of this case that troubles me is how quickly Carly's trial proceeded to sentencing.

I understand that sentencing followed immediately after the jury returned its verdict, rather than being scheduled for a separate later date.

When a defendant is only 14 years old and faces the possibility of lifelong imprisonment, I would have expected the sentencing process to allow the fullest possible opportunity for detailed consideration of her circumstances.

This includes her developmental age, mental health, psychiatric evidence, personal history and prospects for rehabilitation.

Although I recognise that sentencing evidence could be presented, I question whether the immediate progression from verdict to sentence was appropriate given the extraordinary consequences for such a young defendant.

I respectfully ask that the Court examine whether the process provided sufficient time and opportunity for a fully individualised sentencing decision.

4. Confusion surrounding the jury's sentencing options

I am also concerned about the apparent uncertainty surrounding the difference between life imprisonment and life imprisonment without parole.

These are not interchangeable sentences.

They carry fundamentally different consequences for the person receiving them.

If the jury was presented with sentencing alternatives that were unclear or legally inaccurate, it is important to consider whether that confusion may have affected the decision.

The Court's later clarification of the legal meaning of Carly's sentence makes this issue particularly important.

I am also troubled by reports that jurors were given suggestions about the possibility of Carly being released after a comparatively short period if parole were available.

Such statements could have influenced how the jury viewed its sentencing choices.

I respectfully ask that the Court reconsider the clarity of the instructions and the potential effect of the sentencing arguments.

5. Mental health and the treatment of a 14-year-old defendant

Carly's age and psychiatric circumstances should never be treated as secondary considerations.

At 14, a child's brain is still developing, particularly in areas associated with judgment, emotional regulation, impulse control and understanding long-term consequences.

Mental health evidence can also be crucial to understanding a child's behaviour and determining an appropriate sentence.

None of these considerations removes responsibility for serious offences.

They do, however, make careful assessment and individualised sentencing particularly important.

I respectfully support further examination of the mental health evidence, the psychiatric assessment process and whether Carly received the procedural protections appropriate to her age.

6. The 2019 murder of Erica Hall – Pike County, Mississippi

I would also like to draw attention to the proceedings following the death of Erica Hall, aged 32, in Pike County, Mississippi, on 4 January 2019.

A 14-year-old girl was charged as an adult in connection with her mother's murder.

The accused child was released on bond in March 2019, and published reports indicated that the case had still not proceeded to trial by November 2024.

The proceedings were transferred to Panola County because of concerns about pretrial publicity, and a psychological evaluation was ordered.

I appreciate that release before trial is legally distinct from imprisonment following conviction.

However, the comparison raises questions for me about the time and procedural consideration afforded to children facing very serious charges.

In the Erica Hall proceedings, there was an extended period for legal preparation, evaluation and consideration of publicity concerns.

Carly's proceedings, by contrast, resulted in conviction and immediate sentencing within a much shorter period.

I am not suggesting that another child should have received harsher treatment. I am asking whether Carly was afforded the fullest possible consideration of her circumstances and legal rights.

Case identification: Murder of Erica Hall, Pike County, Mississippi, 4 January 2019; proceedings subsequently transferred to Panola County. Official cause number not yet confirmed.

7. The 2011 murder of Alicia Michelle Vega – Warren County, Mississippi

A further case that I believe deserves consideration concerns the death of Alicia Michelle Vega, aged 32, who was fatally shot in Warren County, Mississippi, on 2 May 2011.

Her 14-year-old stepdaughter was accused in connection with the killing.

The proceedings involved mental health assessments, substantial delays and a trial in March 2014 that ended without a unanimous jury verdict.

I understand that the defendant ultimately served approximately seven years in custody and was subsequently released.

I believe the final outcome should be confirmed against the official records, but the reported period in custody raises an important point about how the criminal justice system addresses serious offences committed by children.

I recognise that the circumstances and legal outcomes of individual cases may differ considerably.

Nevertheless, both this case and the Erica Hall proceedings demonstrate the importance of carefully considering the age, mental health, circumstances and rehabilitation potential of children involved in homicide cases.

My purpose is not to argue that these cases are legally identical to Carly's. It is to ask that her case receive the same seriousness of consideration and that her lawful opportunities for rehabilitation are preserved.

Case identification: Murder of Alicia Michelle Vega, Warren County, Mississippi, 2 May 2011. Official court cause number not yet confirmed.

8. Public identification and media coverage of a child

As someone living in England, I have also found the extent of Carly's public exposure deeply concerning.

In the United Kingdom, children involved in criminal proceedings may benefit from significant protections against public identification, although the rules vary and exceptions exist.

I understand that Mississippi operates under a different legal framework, and I do not intend this as criticism of the United States.

However, seeing a 14-year-old child's name, face and court appearances repeatedly published and broadcast has made me question whether sufficient consideration was given to her age and vulnerability.

The consequences of such publicity can continue long after court proceedings have ended.

It may affect a young person's mental wellbeing, dignity and prospects of eventual reintegration into society.

Children deserve compassion, appropriate protection and recognition of their developmental vulnerability, regardless of which country they live in.

The legal system may differ between England and Mississippi, but the fundamental needs of a child do not.

9. My request to the Court

For these reasons, I respectfully support Carly Gregg's request for an oral rehearing.

I ask that the Court give further consideration to the sentencing instructions, the jury's understanding of parole, the immediate sentencing process, Carly's mental health evidence and the overall fairness of the proceedings.

Above all, I request that the Court ensure that its determination regarding parole eligibility is formally communicated to MDOC and accurately reflected in Carly's correctional records.

If Carly's life sentences are legally parole-eligible, her records should say so clearly.

The applicable minimum period before parole consideration should be established in accordance with the law, and her eligibility date should be formally calculated.

There should be no continuing uncertainty caused by the absence of a written instruction or failure to implement the Court's ruling.

10. Closing appeal

I recognise that the Court must uphold the law and consider the seriousness of the offences and the harm caused to the victims and their families.

At the same time, I believe justice must remain fair, transparent and attentive to the particular vulnerabilities of children.

Carly was 14 years old.

Whatever her responsibility for the events that occurred, her age should remain a significant consideration when examining the fairness of the proceedings and the meaning of her sentence.

I respectfully ask that she be given the benefit of every safeguard provided by law and that her sentence be administered exactly as the Court has determined.

A genuine opportunity for future parole consideration does not diminish accountability. It allows for the possibility that a child may mature, accept responsibility and demonstrate rehabilitation over time.

Thank you for considering my letter and the concerns I have raised from England.

Yours faithfully,

Stephanie Gilby
England, United KingdomDear Honourable Justices of the Mississippi Supreme Court,

My name is Stephanie Gilby, and I am writing from England to express my support for the request for an oral rehearing in the case of Carly Madison Gregg.

I appreciate that this case concerns a terrible loss of life and has caused immeasurable pain to those affected. I do not wish to minimise the seriousness of the offences or the suffering of the victims' loved ones.

My concern is that Carly was only 14 years old when these events occurred, and I believe every aspect of her trial, sentencing and future parole eligibility deserves the closest possible scrutiny.

1. The urgent need to correct Carly's parole status

The issue that concerns me most is the reported discrepancy between the Mississippi Supreme Court's ruling and the records maintained by the Mississippi Department of Corrections (MDOC).

My understanding is that the Supreme Court clarified in its decision of 20 August 2026 that Carly's life sentences were not sentences of life without the possibility of parole.

Despite this, it has been reported that MDOC continued to classify her as ineligible for parole because it had not received the formal notification necessary to change her records.

If that position remains unresolved, it raises a serious concern about whether the Court's decision is being given practical effect.

A judicial ruling should not leave a person serving a sentence under an inaccurate correctional classification.

I respectfully request that the Court issue a specific written directive, through whatever procedure is legally appropriate, requiring MDOC to amend Carly's official records to reflect the correct sentence.

This should include formal confirmation of her parole-eligible status, the applicable statutory minimum period she must serve and the earliest date on which she may lawfully be considered for parole.

I am not asking for Carly to be released immediately or for any guarantee that parole will eventually be granted.

I am asking that the opportunity to be considered for parole, if provided by law, is clearly recognised and not lost through an administrative failure.

2. A definite minimum period before parole consideration

I believe it is essential that Carly's sentence has a clear and legally established meaning.

If she is eligible for parole, the minimum period required before consideration should be identified, calculated and entered into her official records.

A young person sentenced to life imprisonment should not face uncertainty about whether she will ever have the opportunity to demonstrate rehabilitation.

Carly was 14 at the time of the offences. She will continue to develop emotionally, psychologically and intellectually throughout her years in custody.

Her future eligibility for parole would allow the relevant authorities to assess her progress, conduct, maturity and risk at the appropriate time.

That opportunity is not the same as forgiveness or automatic release. It is a recognition that a child may be capable of substantial change.

3. The speed of the proceedings and sentencing

Another aspect of this case that troubles me is how quickly Carly's trial proceeded to sentencing.

I understand that sentencing followed immediately after the jury returned its verdict, rather than being scheduled for a separate later date.

When a defendant is only 14 years old and faces the possibility of lifelong imprisonment, I would have expected the sentencing process to allow the fullest possible opportunity for detailed consideration of her circumstances.

This includes her developmental age, mental health, psychiatric evidence, personal history and prospects for rehabilitation.

Although I recognise that sentencing evidence could be presented, I question whether the immediate progression from verdict to sentence was appropriate given the extraordinary consequences for such a young defendant.

I respectfully ask that the Court examine whether the process provided sufficient time and opportunity for a fully individualised sentencing decision.

4. Confusion surrounding the jury's sentencing options

I am also concerned about the apparent uncertainty surrounding the difference between life imprisonment and life imprisonment without parole.

These are not interchangeable sentences.

They carry fundamentally different consequences for the person receiving them.

If the jury was presented with sentencing alternatives that were unclear or legally inaccurate, it is important to consider whether that confusion may have affected the decision.

The Court's later clarification of the legal meaning of Carly's sentence makes this issue particularly important.

I am also troubled by reports that jurors were given suggestions about the possibility of Carly being released after a comparatively short period if parole were available.

Such statements could have influenced how the jury viewed its sentencing choices.

I respectfully ask that the Court reconsider the clarity of the instructions and the potential effect of the sentencing arguments.

5. Mental health and the treatment of a 14-year-old defendant

Carly's age and psychiatric circumstances should never be treated as secondary considerations.

At 14, a child's brain is still developing, particularly in areas associated with judgment, emotional regulation, impulse control and understanding long-term consequences.

Mental health evidence can also be crucial to understanding a child's behaviour and determining an appropriate sentence.

None of these considerations removes responsibility for serious offences.

They do, however, make careful assessment and individualised sentencing particularly important.

I respectfully support further examination of the mental health evidence, the psychiatric assessment process and whether Carly received the procedural protections appropriate to her age.

6. The 2019 murder of Erica Hall – Pike County, Mississippi

I would also like to draw attention to the proceedings following the death of Erica Hall, aged 32, in Pike County, Mississippi, on 4 January 2019.

A 14-year-old girl was charged as an adult in connection with her mother's murder.

The accused child was released on bond in March 2019, and published reports indicated that the case had still not proceeded to trial by November 2024.

The proceedings were transferred to Panola County because of concerns about pretrial publicity, and a psychological evaluation was ordered.

I appreciate that release before trial is legally distinct from imprisonment following conviction.

However, the comparison raises questions for me about the time and procedural consideration afforded to children facing very serious charges.

In the Erica Hall proceedings, there was an extended period for legal preparation, evaluation and consideration of publicity concerns.

Carly's proceedings, by contrast, resulted in conviction and immediate sentencing within a much shorter period.

I am not suggesting that another child should have received harsher treatment. I am asking whether Carly was afforded the fullest possible consideration of her circumstances and legal rights.

Case identification: Murder of Erica Hall, Pike County, Mississippi, 4 January 2019; proceedings subsequently transferred to Panola County. Official cause number not yet confirmed.

7. The 2011 murder of Alicia Michelle Vega – Warren County, Mississippi

A further case that I believe deserves consideration concerns the death of Alicia Michelle Vega, aged 32, who was fatally shot in Warren County, Mississippi, on 2 May 2011.

Her 14-year-old stepdaughter was accused in connection with the killing.

The proceedings involved mental health assessments, substantial delays and a trial in March 2014 that ended without a unanimous jury verdict.

I understand that the defendant ultimately served approximately seven years in custody and was subsequently released.

I believe the final outcome should be confirmed against the official records, but the reported period in custody raises an important point about how the criminal justice system addresses serious offences committed by children.

I recognise that the circumstances and legal outcomes of individual cases may differ considerably.

Nevertheless, both this case and the Erica Hall proceedings demonstrate the importance of carefully considering the age, mental health, circumstances and rehabilitation potential of children involved in homicide cases.

My purpose is not to argue that these cases are legally identical to Carly's. It is to ask that her case receive the same seriousness of consideration and that her lawful opportunities for rehabilitation are preserved.

Case identification: Murder of Alicia Michelle Vega, Warren County, Mississippi, 2 May 2011. Official court cause number not yet confirmed.

8. Public identification and media coverage of a child

As someone living in England, I have also found the extent of Carly's public exposure deeply concerning.

In the United Kingdom, children involved in criminal proceedings may benefit from significant protections against public identification, although the rules vary and exceptions exist.

I understand that Mississippi operates under a different legal framework, and I do not intend this as criticism of the United States.

However, seeing a 14-year-old child's name, face and court appearances repeatedly published and broadcast has made me question whether sufficient consideration was given to her age and vulnerability.

The consequences of such publicity can continue long after court proceedings have ended.

It may affect a young person's mental wellbeing, dignity and prospects of eventual reintegration into society.

Children deserve compassion, appropriate protection and recognition of their developmental vulnerability, regardless of which country they live in.

The legal system may differ between England and Mississippi, but the fundamental needs of a child do not.

9. My request to the Court

For these reasons, I respectfully support Carly Gregg's request for an oral rehearing.

I ask that the Court give further consideration to the sentencing instructions, the jury's understanding of parole, the immediate sentencing process, Carly's mental health evidence and the overall fairness of the proceedings.

Above all, I request that the Court ensure that its determination regarding parole eligibility is formally communicated to MDOC and accurately reflected in Carly's correctional records.

If Carly's life sentences are legally parole-eligible, her records should say so clearly.

The applicable minimum period before parole consideration should be established in accordance with the law, and her eligibility date should be formally calculated.

There should be no continuing uncertainty caused by the absence of a written instruction or failure to implement the Court's ruling.

10. Closing appeal

I recognise that the Court must uphold the law and consider the seriousness of the offences and the harm caused to the victims and their families.

At the same time, I believe justice must remain fair, transparent and attentive to the particular vulnerabilities of children.

Carly was 14 years old.

Whatever her responsibility for the events that occurred, her age should remain a significant consideration when examining the fairness of the proceedings and the meaning of her sentence.

I respectfully ask that she be given the benefit of every safeguard provided by law and that her sentence be administered exactly as the Court has determined.

A genuine opportunity for future parole consideration does not diminish accountability. It allows for the possibility that a child may mature, accept responsibility and demonstrate rehabilitation over time.

Thank you for considering my letter and the concerns I have raised from England.

Yours faithfully,

Stephanie Gilby
England, United Kingdom