

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

OPINION

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