

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 16-KH-0830

STATE EX REL. ANTHONY RICHARDSON

v.

STATE OF LOUISIANA

**ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE CRIMINAL
DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF ORLEANS**

PER CURIAM:

Denied. Relator does not identify an illegal term in his sentence, and therefore his 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. Relator's sentencing claim is not cognizable on collateral review. La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.3; *State ex rel. Melinie v. State*, 93-1380 (La. 1/12/96), 665 So.2d 1172; *State v. Cotton*, 09-2397 (La. 10/15/10), 45 So.3d 1030. The application is also repetitive. La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.4. *See State v. Richardson*, 14-0754 (11/26/14), 155 So.3d 87, *writ denied*, 15-0105 (La. 11/6/15), 180 So.3d 306.

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