

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

STATE EX REL. CHRIS BARNES

No.2021-KH-00060

VS.

STATE OF LOUISIANA

IN RE: Chris Barnes - Applicant Plaintiff; Applying For Supervisory Writ, Parish of Jefferson, 24th Judicial District Court Number(s) 97-666, Court of Appeal, Fifth Circuit, Number(s) 20-KH-370;

March 02, 2021

Writ application denied. See per curiam.

JTG

JLW

JDH


SJC

WJC

JBM

PDG

Supreme Court of Louisiana
March 02, 2021


Clerk of Court
For the Court

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 21-KH-0060

STATE EX REL. CHRIS BARNES

v.

STATE OF LOUISIANA

**ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF JEFFERSON**

PER CURIAM:

Denied. The application was not timely filed in the district court, and applicant fails to carry his burden to show that an exception applies. La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.8; *see State ex rel. Glover v. State*, 93-2330, pp. 9-11 (La. 9/5/95), 660 So.2d 1189, 1195-96 (distinguishing habeas corpus from post-conviction relief and endorsing La.C.Cr.P. art. 351 and its cmt. (c), which states that “habeas corpus is not the proper procedural device for petitioners who may file applications for post conviction relief; rather, it “deals with pre-conviction complaints concerning custody.”).

Applicant has now fully litigated his application for post-conviction relief in state court. Similar to federal habeas relief, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2244, Louisiana post-conviction procedure envisions the filing of a second or successive application only under the narrow circumstances provided in La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.4 and within the limitations period as set out in La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.8. Notably, the legislature in 2013 La. Acts 251 amended that article to make the procedural bars against successive filings mandatory. Applicant’s claims have now been fully litigated in accord with La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.6, and this denial is final. Hereafter, unless he can

show that one of the narrow exceptions authorizing the filing of a successive application applies, applicant has exhausted his right to state collateral review. The district court is ordered to record a minute entry consistent with this per curiam.