

**SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA**

**No. 18-KP-0649**

**STATE OF LOUISIANA**

**v.**

**LEOPOLD “CHUCK” LACOSTE, II**

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

**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 claims are 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; *see also State v. Cotton*, 09-2397 (La. 10/15/10), 45 So.3d 1030.

Relator has now fully litigated an 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 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. Relator’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, relator has exhausted his right to state collateral review. The district court is ordered to record a minute entry consistent with this per curiam.