In addition, the case of "**Singleton v. Wulff**[10]" established that a party may assert the constitutional rights of others when there are a close relationship and a genuine obstacle preventing the right-holder from suing directly. Also, the case of Singleton formalized the modern two-part test for third-party standing, the test comprehends two frameworks as "**Close relationship**" and "**Hindrance**". So, under the two-part test framework, an assessment must be conducted within the light of Craig v. Boren: firstly, it's clarified that there is a close relation for Whitener in the concrete event and a genuine obstacle preventing the right-holder from suing directly (hindrance) is obvious as well. So; case of Singleton provides the doctrinal backbone for the third-party standing analysis used in Craig v. Boren:

"hindrance" is obvious for the Whitener, and also there is a close relation in the context of locus standi. Latter, this precedent refers that vendors and those in like positions have been uniformly permitted to resist efforts at restricting their operation by acting as advocates of the rights of third parties who seek access to their market or function. So; within the light of that precedent that is revealed in 1976, (exact same year that the mentioned case[11] was in the judicial process), "Carolyn Whitener" has the locus standi - right to be a party- in this case as well.

However, from a dissenting opinion, Chief Justice Burger objected to the section of the majority's opinion on the standing issue. The Chief Justice reasoned that the alleged economic harm was too attenuated to trigger procedural due process protections.

[10] 428 US 106, 1976

[11] Craig v. Boren