

**SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA**

**No. 15-KH-1278**

**STATE EX REL. LISA HOYT**

**v.**

**STATE OF LOUISIANA**

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

**PER CURIAM:**

Denied. Relator does not identify an illegal term in her sentence, and therefore, her filing is properly construed as an application for post-conviction relief. See State v. Parker, 98-0256 (La. 5/8/98), 711 So.2d 694. As such, it is subject to the time limitation set forth in La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.8. Relator's application was not timely filed in the district court, and she fails to carry her burden to show that an exception applies. La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.8; State ex rel. Glover v. State, 93-2330 (La. 9/5/95), 660 So.2d 1189.

Relator has now fully litigated her 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 La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.4 to make the procedural bars against successive filings mandatory. Relator's claims have now been fully litigated in state collateral proceedings in accord with La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.6, and this denial is final. Hereafter, unless relator can show that one of the narrow

exceptions authorizing the filing of a successive application applies, relator has exhausted her right to state collateral review. The District Court is ordered to record a minute entry consistent with this per curiam.