

LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, THIRD CIRCUIT

State of Louisiana v. Lee Gallow

No. 26 00264-KW, Louisiana Court of Appeal, Third Circuit (June 17, 2026)

SUMMARY

The Louisiana Court of Appeal, Third Circuit denied Lee Gallow's application for rehearing in a writ proceeding arising from Evangeline Parish. The court explained that rehearing is available under Uniform Rules—Courts of Appeal, Rule 2-18.7(1) when the court has granted a writ application on the merits, and directed that any challenge to the original denial be made by timely application to the Louisiana Supreme Court.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Louisiana Court of Appeal, Third Circuit
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Shannon J. Gremillion; Sharon Darville Wilson; Ledricka J. Thierry
JURISDICTION	Louisiana Court of Appeal, Third Circuit
DECIDED	June 17, 2026
DOCKET	26 00264-KW
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Lee Gallow sought rehearing of the Louisiana Court of Appeal's prior denial of his writ application. The court denied rehearing.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Not designated for publication
PARTIES	Lee Gallow v. State of Louisiana

TOPICS

- appellate procedure
- writ of certiorari
- criminal procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Louisiana criminal procedure
- appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

- Whether the court could consider an application for rehearing when it had denied, rather than granted, the writ application on the merits.

2. Whether the proper method to challenge the appellate court's writ ruling was an application for writs to the Louisiana Supreme Court.

HOLDINGS

1. An application for rehearing is considered under Uniform Rules—Courts of Appeal, Rule 2-18.7(1), only when the court has granted a writ application on the merits; because the court denied Gallow's writ application, rehearing was properly denied.
2. The proper remedy for challenging the appellate court's ruling on the writ application is a timely application for writs to the Louisiana Supreme Court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Uniform Rules—Courts of Appeal, Rule 2–18.7(1) provides that an application for rehearing will be considered in cases where the court has granted a writ application on the merits.”

“Accordingly, the proper remedy to challenge this court’s ruling on the writ is a timely application for writs to the Louisiana Supreme Court.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The opinion contains no substantive factual discussion concerning the underlying criminal matter. It addresses only Gallow's application for rehearing of the appellate court's prior denial of his writ application.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter arose from Evangeline Parish Case No. 155643-F. The Louisiana Court of Appeal, Third Circuit, previously denied Gallow's writ application. On rehearing, the court concluded that rehearing was unavailable because the court had not granted the writ application on the merits and denied the application for rehearing.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

OPINION

State of Louisiana v. Lee Gallow

PER CURIAM.

STATE OF LOUISIANA

COURT OF APPEAL, THIRD CIRCUIT

P.O. Box 16577 Lake Charles LA 70616

(337) 433-9403

NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

Gregory Cook Attorney at Law 1746 Wooddale Blvd Baton Rouge LA 70806 Judgment on rehearing rendered and mailed to all parties or counsel of record on June 17, 2026 REHEARING

ACTION: June 17, 2026 Docket Number: 26 00264-KW

STATE OF LOUISIANA

VERSUS

LEE GALLOW

Writ Application from Evangeline Parish Case No. 155643-F BEFORE JUDGES: Hon. Shannon J. Gremillion Hon. Sharon Darville Wilson Hon. Ledricka J. Thierry As counsel of record in the captioned case, you are hereby notified that the ruling on the application for rehearing filed by Lee Gallow is: REHEARING DENIED. Uniform Rules—Courts of Appeal, Rule 2–18.7(1) provides that an application for rehearing will be considered in cases where the court has granted a writ application on the merits. In its original writ ruling herein, this court denied Defendant’s writ application. Accordingly, the proper remedy to challenge this court’s ruling on the writ is a timely application for writs to the Louisiana Supreme Court. cc: Hon. Trent Brignac, Counsel for the Respondent Jacob B. Fusilier, Counsel for the Respondent