

When the both cases are considered, an analogy can be drawn between the black race in the “**Plessy case**” and the men under the Statute of Oklahoma. So, to protect the doctrine of “**stare decisis**” in the case of ‘Craig v. Boren’; if the problem is about the ‘separate but equal’ doctrine, the Oklahoma State law must be argued within the scope of “Equal Protection Clause”.

Evaluation through the “**Standing**” and “**Mootness Doctrine**”:

“**Craig v. Boren**” must be argued with the criteria hereby mentioned (**mootness doctrine**) while **Craig** turns the age of 21, he will no longer be affected by the Oklahoma statute that regulates the men who are under the age of 21 cannot buy the %3,2 percent non-intoxicating beer. While Craig appeals that case, he was under the age of 21 so he has the right to stand - **locus standi**- in the case as a party (plaintiff). However; while in the judicial process of this case he turned the age of 21, and according to that, he cannot be a party. And for the “**standing**” criteria, according to the “**Eisenstadt v. Baird**”⁸ precedent, the parties who are directly affected by a statute may challenge its constitutionality when there is a “**direct causal nexus**” between the law and their injury. So, when an interpretation made for the Craig v. Boren case’s standing party, Carolyn Whitener, under the trajectory of this⁹ precedent; Whitener, the beer vendor, had standing to challenge the Oklahoma statute while there is a “**direct causal nexus**” between law and her injury.

⁸ 405 US 438, 1972

⁹ Eisenstadt v. Baird