

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.

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 La. 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). “CQURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT DO ic “ep ERE OF COURT. FOR THE COURT

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/first-circuit/2026/state-of-louisiana-v-american-electronic-monitoring-llc-wft2s2y0>