

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

STATE OF LOUISIANA

No. 2023-KH-00332

VS.

EDDIE LANG

IN RE: Eddie Lang - Applicant Defendant; Applying For Supervisory Writ, Parish of West Feliciana, 20th Judicial District Court Number(s) 22-WCR-080, Court of Appeal, First Circuit, Number(s) 2022 KW 1167;

September 19, 2023

Writ application denied. See per curiam.

PDG
JLW
JDH
SJC
JTG
WJC
JBM

Supreme Court of Louisiana
September 19, 2023

Katio Marjanovic
Chief Deputy Clerk of Court
For the Court

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 23-KH-0332

STATE OF LOUISIANA

v.

EDDIE LANG

**ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE TWENTIETH
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF WEST FELICIANA**

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 two applications 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.