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Discussion Board: Criminal Law for Criminal Justice

There are different levels of scrutiny under the equal protection clause, and each level has its significance. The most prominent levels in this regard are the strict scrutiny level, middle-tier level, and the minimum level. The government has the burden of proving, under close inspection, that the challenged classification is necessary to serve a compelling state interest and that the challenged classification itself is needed to accomplish that goal (Beschle). However, the government is required to demonstrate that the classification in question serves a major state interest and is at the very least considerably relevant to the accomplishment of that purpose if it is challenged at the middle-tier level (Paulsen). As part of the minimum inspection, government officials are required to establish that the contentious category serves a legitimate purpose on behalf of the government. It is important to note that several decisions made by the Supreme Court have hinted that categories that discriminate against mentally disabled individuals, homosexuals, or the innocent offspring of illegal immigrants may be subject to a slightly more stringent examination of the state's interest.

Race classifications that are explicitly based on race are subject to the strictest examination and are usually invalidated; similarly, classifications based on sex and nationality are subject to the proper amount of scrutiny for the classification. Racism or prejudice on any other illegal grounds cannot be justified by an appearance of neutrality in a categorization (White). It is significantly more difficult to argue that legislation, which is in effect neutral, has an unduly negative impact on a racial minority or another group that is particularly qualified for the protection of the Equal Protection Clause. Therefore, it will be of great significance if an individual challenges a neutral law that is biased and discriminatory because each living in the United States has equal rights.
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