

**SUPREME COURT OF LOUISIANA**

**No. 16-KH-0518**

**STATE EX REL. WILLIAM DAVID POWELL**

**v.**

**STATE OF LOUISIANA**

**ON SUPERVISORY WRITS TO THE TWENTY-SECOND  
JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF WASHINGTON**

**PER CURIAM:**

Denied. Relator abandoned his pro-se pre-trial motions when he proceeded to trial without obtaining rulings on them, *see* La.C.Cr.P. art. 841, and therefore shows no error in the court's failure to issue such rulings. Relator also fails to show that he received ineffective assistance of counsel, *see Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668, 104 S.Ct. 2052, 80 L.Ed.2d 674 (1984), as a result of counsel's failure to adopt and argue the pro-se motions or as a result of counsel's trial strategy. La.C.Cr.P. art. 930.2.

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 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.