

12/16/2016 "See News Release 076 for any Concurrences and/or Dissents."

SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA

No. 15-KH-1916

STATE EX REL. RODNEY HAMILTON

v.

STATE OF LOUISIANA

ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH

JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF JEFFERSON

PER CURIAM:

Denied. Relator's application was not timely filed in the District Court, and he has failed 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. In addition, 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; *see also State v. Thomas*, 07-0634 (La. 1/11/08), 972 So.2d 323.

Relator has now fully litigated nearly a dozen applications 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 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.