

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

STATE OF LOUISIANA

No. 2021-KH-00393

VS.

KENTREAL JARBAR HOWARD

IN RE: Kentreal Jabar Howard - Applicant Defendant; Applying For Supervisory Writ, Parish of Terrebonne, 32nd Judicial District Court Number(s) 718291 C/W 744470, Court of Appeal, First Circuit, Number(s) 2020 KW 1102;

May 11, 2021

Writ application denied. See per curiam.

WJC

JDH

SJC

JTG


JBM

PDG

Griffin, J., concurs and would deny on the showing made.
Weimer, C. J., recused.

Supreme Court of Louisiana

May 11, 2021



Chief Deputy Clerk of Court
For the Court

05/11/21

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 21-KH-0393

STATE OF LOUISIANA

v.

KENTREAL JARBAR HOWARD

**ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE THIRTY-SECOND
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF TERREBONNE**

PER CURIAM:

Denied. Applicant fails to show that he received ineffective assistance of counsel under the standard of *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984). Applicant also fails to show that the state withheld material exculpatory evidence in violation of *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963). As to his remaining claims, applicant fails to satisfy his post-conviction burden of proof. La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.2.

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.