

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 18-KH-1732

ANDREW PAYNE

v.

STATE OF LOUISIANA

**ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF JEFFERSON**

PER CURIAM:

Denied. Applicant 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. As such, it is subject to the time limitation set forth in La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.8. 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; *State ex rel. Glover v. State*, 93-2330 (La. 9/5/95), 660 So.2d 1189.

Applicant 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 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.