

LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT

State of Louisiana v. American Electronic Monitoring, LLC

No. 2026 KW 0012 (La. Ct. App. 2026) · No. 2026 KW 0012 · Decided January 9, 2026

SUMMARY

The Louisiana Court of Appeal, First Circuit denied the State of Louisiana's application for supervisory writs in a dispute involving the exclusion of expert testimony concerning electronic monitoring systems. In a dissent, Judge Edwards would have granted the writ and reversed the district court, concluding that the proposed expert's experience and methodology satisfied Louisiana Code of Evidence article 702 and Daubert.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Louisiana Court of Appeal, First Circuit
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Per curiam; Miller, J.; Edwards, J.; Fields, J.
JURISDICTION	Louisiana Court of Appeal, First Circuit
DECIDED	January 9, 2026
DOCKET	2026 KW 0012
DISPOSITION	writ_denied
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The State of Louisiana applied for a supervisory writ challenging the Twentieth Judicial District Court's ruling denying expert testimony by Mr. Dennis in the field of electronic monitoring systems.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The majority did not state a standard of review. The dissent characterized the alleged error as an abuse of discretion.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unknown
PARTIES	State of Louisiana v. American Electronic Monitoring, LLC

TOPICS

- writ of certiorari
- appellate procedure
- expert testimony
- daubert standard
- evidence

PRACTICE AREAS

- Appellate procedure
- Evidence

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the court should grant the State's supervisory writ and reverse the district court's denial of expert testimony by Mr. Dennis concerning electronic monitoring systems.

HOLDINGS

1. The Louisiana Court of Appeal, First Circuit, denied the State's supervisory writ.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“Edwards, J., dissents and would grant the writ and reverse the district court’s ruling denying expert testimony by Mr. Dennis in the field of electronic monitoring systems.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The proposed expert, Mr. Dennis, had worked extensively with electronic ankle monitoring for eleven years and was director of a Louisiana program supervising and monitoring offenders released by court order or on bond. His company monitored approximately 400 offenders at a time and used electronic monitoring to track compliance with court orders and bond conditions. According to the dissent, he testified about his company's standards and methodology based on his experience and knowledge.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The matter arose from proceedings in the Twentieth Judicial District Court for the Parish of West Feliciana, case number 22-WFLN-238. The State sought supervisory review of the district court's ruling denying the admission of Mr. Dennis's expert testimony. The Louisiana Court of Appeal, First Circuit, denied the writ; Judge Edwards dissented and would have granted the writ and reversed.

DISPOSITION

writ_denied

CASES CITED

- Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579, 113 S. Ct. 2786, 125 L. Ed. 2d 469 (1993)

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

STATE OF LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT STATE OF LOUISIANA NO. 2026 KW 0012 VERSUS AMERICAN ELECTRONIC JANUARY 09, 2026 MONITORING, LLC In Re: State of Louisiana, applying for supervisory writs, 20th Judicial District Court, Parish of West Feliciana, No. 22-WFLN-238. BEFORE: MILLER, EDWARDS, AND FIELDS, JJ. WRIT DENIED. SMM WEF Edwards, J., dissents and would grant the writ and reverse the district court’s ruling denying expert testimony by Mr. Dennis in the field of electronic monitoring systems.

I find merit in the State's contention that the lower court abused its discretion. Mr. Dennis has been working extensively with electronic ankle monitoring for eleven years. At the time of the hearing, he was the director of the Assured Supervision Accountability Program which supervises and monitors offenders released by court order or on bond through bail agents, throughout Louisiana; a position he's held since 2014.

His company uses electronic monitoring to track the movements of individuals to ensure they follow court orders or bond conditions and monitors an average of 400 offenders at any given time. During his testimony, Mr. Dennis provided details regarding the standards and methodology used by his own company in accordance with his own experience and knowledge.

Thus, I find the State met its burden of showing Mr. Dennis could assist the trier of fact to understand evidence or determine a fact at issue and that his practices were the product of reliable principles and methods and based upon sufficient facts and data. See *Id.* Code of Evid. art. 702; *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc.*, 509 U.S. 579, 113 S.Ct.

2786, 125 L.Ed.2d 469 (1993). “COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT DO ic “ep ERE OF COURT. FOR THE COURT