

LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND CIRCUIT

Tyshequa Boykins on Behalf of Kylin Boykins v. Stevie Holloway

No. 56,545-CA · No. 56,545-CA · Decided December 3, 2025

SUMMARY

The Louisiana Second Circuit Court of Appeal reviewed a protective order issued in favor of Kylin Boykins against Stevie Holloway. The court affirmed the protective order, reversed the firearm prohibition because Holloway was not a qualifying family, household, or dating-partner relationship, and remanded to reduce the order's duration to the maximum period permitted by statute. The appeal was consolidated with related protective-order appeals.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Louisiana Court of Appeal, Second Circuit
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Marcotte, J.; Pitman, J.; Stephens, J.
JURISDICTION	Louisiana Court of Appeal, Second Circuit
DECIDED	December 3, 2025
DOCKET	56,545-CA
DISPOSITION	reversed_and_remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Stevie Holloway appealed the granting of a protective order against him in favor of Kylin Boykins.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published memorandum opinion
PARTIES	Stevie Holloway v. Tyshequa Boykins on behalf of Kylin Boykins

TOPICS

- injunctions
- remedies
- appellate procedure
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- civil procedure
- appellate procedure
- protective orders
- remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the trial court applied the correct definition of stalking under La. R.S. 14:40.2.
- Whether Stevie Holloway represented a credible threat to the physical safety of a person eligible for the protective-order relief.

3. Whether the trial court could prohibit Stevie Holloway from possessing a firearm under La. R.S. 46:2136.3.
4. Whether the trial court could impose a two-year duration for the protective order under La. R.S. 46:2136(F).

HOLDINGS

1. The trial court correctly issued a protective order in favor of Kylin Boykins against Stevie Holloway.
2. The firearm-possession prohibition was improper because Stevie Holloway was not a family member, household member, or dating partner of Kylin Boykins.
3. The trial court erred by granting the protective order for two years; the fixed duration had to be reduced to the maximum period allowed by La. R.S. 46:2136(F).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Tyshequa Boykins alleged that on January 1, 2025, Stevie Holloway used a bat to charge at her son, Kylin Boykins, during an incident at a store and restaurant in Joaquin, Texas. She further alleged that the incident caused Boykins to suffer a bruised eye and a cut foot and included racial verbal abuse. Boykins sought protective relief, and the trial court issued a protective order against Stevie.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Tyshequa Boykins filed petitions for protective orders and protection from stalking on behalf of her son, Kylin Boykins, alleging that Stevie Holloway attacked or attempted to attack Boykins with a bat. The Forty-Second Judicial District Court for the Parish of DeSoto granted a protective order against Stevie. The Louisiana Court of Appeal affirmed the issuance of the protective order, reversed the firearm-possession prohibition and the two-year duration, and remanded with instructions.

DISPOSITION

reversed_and_remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The trial court must remove the firearm-possession prohibition against Stevie Holloway and reduce the fixed duration of the protective order to the maximum allowable period under La. R.S. 46:2136(F).

CASES CITED

- Ju’Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway, 56,543 (La. App. 2 Cir. 12/3/25)

OPINION

Tyshequa Boykins on Behalf of Kylin Boykins v. Stevie Holloway
MARCOTTE, J.

Judgment rendered December 3, 2025 Application for rehearing may be filed within the delay

allowed by Art. 2166, La. C.C.P. No. 56,543-CA No. 56,544-CA No. 56,545-CA No. 56,546-CA No. 56,547-CA No. 56,548-CA (Consolidated cases)

COURT OF APPEAL

SECOND CIRCUIT

STATE OF LOUISIANA

***** No. 56,545-CA TYSHEQUA BOYKINS ON BEHALF Plaintiff-Appellee
OF KYLIN BOYKINS

versus STEVIE HOLLOWAY Defendant-Appellant ***** Appealed from the Forty-Second Judicial District Court for the Parish of DeSoto, Louisiana Trial Court No. 85,755 Honorable Amy Burford McCartney, Chief Judge ***** SMITHERMAN, HILL & BRICE, L.C. Counsel for Appellant By: F. Weber Hill TYSHEQUA BOYKINS In Proper Person ***** Before PITMAN, STEPHENS, and MARCOTTE, JJ. STEPHENS, J., concurs in the result. MARCOTTE, J. These consolidated civil appeals arise out the 42nd Judicial District Court, Parish of DeSoto, the Honorable Amy Burford McCartney and the Honorable Nicholas E. Gaspar presiding. Defendant Steve Holloway (“Holloway, Sr.”) appeals the trial court’s granting of three protective orders against him. Defendant Stevie Holloway (“Stevie”) also appeals the trial court’s granting of three protective orders against him. For the following reasons, we affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand with instructions. A separate opinion is issued for each protective order. This memorandum opinion is issued in compliance with U.R.C.A. 2-16.1(B).

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 3, 2025, Tyshequa Boykins (“Tyshequa”) filed on behalf of her son, Kylin Boykins (“Boykins”) (DOB: 6-13-08), two petitions for protective orders against Holloway, Sr. and Stevie (together “the Holloways”). She alleged that on January 1, 2025, while at Blink’s Quick Stop Store/Whataburger in Joaquin, Texas, Holloway, Sr. instructed Stevie to attack Boykins believing him to be his brother, Ju’Kadynn Carter. Tyshequa stated that Holloway, Sr. continued to chase Boykins with a gun to his vehicle and towards his residence. She said that the incident resulted in Boykins having to go to the hospital with a bruised eye and cut on his foot. She said Stevie used a bat to charge at Boykins. She also alleged verbal abuse by making racial comments. On January 16, 2025, Tyshequa filed two new petitions for protection from stalking in favor of Boykins against the Holloways alleging the same facts. For a recitation of the facts and procedural history, see Ju’Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway, 56,543 (La. App. 2 Cir. 12/3/25). On January 16, 2025, Judge McCartney granted a protective order in favor of Boykins against Stevie. Stevie now appeals.

DISCUSSION

Stevie assigns the following errors:

- (1) The trial court erred in failing to apply the correct definition of stalking in accordance with La. R.S. 14:40.2.
- (2) The trial court erred in finding that Stevie represented a credible threat to

the physical safety of a family member, household member, or dating partner.

(3) The trial court erred in prohibiting the possession of a firearm for the duration of the protective order by Stevie pursuant to La. R.S. 46:2136.3.

(4) The trial court erred in granting the protective order for a duration of two years. For the reasons expressed in *Ju’Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway*, supra, Stevie’s first assignment of error is without merit. The trial court was correct in issuing a protective order in favor of Boykins against Stevie. That part of the trial court’s ruling is affirmed. For the reasons articulated in *Ju’Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway*, supra, Stevie’s remaining assignments of error have merit. Stevie is not a family member, household member, or dating partner of Boykins’. Therefore, the trial court should not have prohibited him from possessing a firearm. That part of the trial court’s ruling is reversed. The court also erred in granting the protective order for two years. We remand the case to the trial court to reduce the fixed time for the protective order to the maximum allowable period in accordance with La. R.S. 46:2136(F). 2

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, the trial court’s granting of a protective order against Stevie Holloway in favor of Kylin Boykins is affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded in accordance with this opinion. The costs of the appeal are assessed to appellant.

AFFIRMED IN PART; REVERSED IN PART; REMANDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS. 3