Before the court comes a challenge by /u/dewey-cheatem, hereby referred to as "Petitioner" in regards to the constitutionality of two sections Commonwealth law code § 18.2-362 and § 18.2-363. The Governor failed to appoint counsel for this case, and as such, this court will issue a ruling on the merits alone.

A. "The Statutes Violate the Constitutional Right to Marry"

Marriage is a fundamental right consistently upheld by courts across the country. See *Loving v. Virginia, 388 U. S. 1, 12 (1967). ("Marriage is one of the 'basic civil rights of man,' fundamental to our very existence and survival.")* The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment guarantees equal protection under the laws to each of the citizens. This right has been upheld through this clause in the aforementioned *Loving* case, along with *Obergefell v. Hodges, 576 US (2015)* and *Turner v. Safley, 482 U. S. 78, 95 (1987).* How then, can this court uphold this clause?

B. Section 18.2-362 Violates the Constitutional Right to Privacy.

Privacy is, in addition, a fundamental right that is granted to the citizens in cases across the country. The court agrees with the petitioner's arguments used to grant petition as to how the right to privacy is violated. The government does not have the right to unwarranted intrusions into a dwelling or other private places.

C. The Statutes Do Not Meet The Standard Established Under Virginia Code § 57-2.02.

In cases of discrimination, courts shall apply the test of strict scrutiny to determine whether or not the law furthers a compelling governmental interest. This court finds that the state does not have a compelling interest into why a marital relationship should be limited to two persons. The state did not feel the need to appoint counsel to this case. The court is therefore only left with the implication that the state does not have an interest to limit marital relationships in this way.

Pursuant to the numerous cases upholding this right, this court hereby holds that § 18.2-362 and § 18.2-363 are unconstitutional.