

The Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana

STATE OF LOUISIANA

No. 2025-KK-01296

VS.

ARIAL VALENCIA-LACAYO

IN RE: State of Louisiana - Applicant Plaintiff; Applying For Writ Of Certiorari,
Parish of Orleans Civil, Criminal District Court Number(s) 565-888, Court of
Appeal, Fourth Circuit, Number(s) 2025-K-0541;

October 18, 2025

Writ application granted. See per curiam.

JLW

JBM

Hughes, J., Dissents and would deny the writ.
Crain, J., concurs for the reasons assigned by Justice Cole.
Griffin, J., Dissents and would deny the writ.
Guidry, J., Dissents and would deny the writ.
Cole, J., concurs and assigns reasons.

Supreme Court of Louisiana
October 18, 2025

Katio Marjanovic
Chief Deputy Clerk of Court
For the Court

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 2025-KK-01296

STATE OF LOUISIANA

VS.

ARIAL VALENCIA-LACAYO

On Writ of Certiorari to the Court of Appeal, Fourth Circuit, Parish of Orleans
Civil

PER CURIAM.

Writ granted. A trial court is afforded great discretion when ruling on a motion to suppress, and its ruling will not be disturbed absent abuse of that discretion. *State v. Wilder*, 09-2322, p. 2 (La. 12/18/09), 24 So. 3d 197, 198. “When a trial court makes findings of fact based on the weight of the testimony and the credibility of the witnesses, a reviewing court owes those findings great deference, and may not overturn those findings unless there is no evidence to support those findings.” *State v. Thompson*, 11-0915, pp. 13-14 (La. 5/8/12), 93 So. 3d 553, 563 (quoting *State v. Wells*, 08–2262, p. 4 (La.7/6/10); 45 So. 3d 577, 580).

In this matter, after the hearing on the motion to suppress, the trial court issued a per curiam, observing that, “[a]s the trier of fact,” it had “to determine the credibility of witnesses and the weight their testimony deserves.” Finding the witnesses in this case to be credible, the trial court found sufficient information to establish probable cause. Based on the record before us, we find no abuse of the trial court’s discretion and we find the court of appeal erred in substituting its findings for those of the trial court. Accordingly, the court of appeal’s ruling is reversed, and the trial court’s judgment denying the motion to suppress is reinstated. The case is remanded to the district court for further proceedings