

LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT

State of Louisiana v. Chimezie J. Chiama

2025 KW 1212 · No. 2025 KW 1212 · Decided December 2, 2025

OPINION

PER CURIAM.

STATE OF LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT STATE OF LOUISIANA NO. 2025 KW 1212 VERSUS CHIMEZIE J. CHIAMA DECEMBER 2, 2025 In Re: Chimezie J. Chiama, applying for supervisory writs, 21st Judicial District Court, Parish of Livingston, No. 25-TEMP-035222, BEFORE: THERIOT, PENZATO, AND BALFOUR, JJ. WRIT NOT CONSIDERED.

The prior supervisory writ application was untimely filed and counsel failed to provide an explanation for the delay. Additionally, counsel failed to include documentation showing he timely requested a return date, the return date set by the district court, and a timely request for an extension of the return date. This court provided counsel an opportunity to correct the rule violations contained in the prior supervisory writ application.

See State v. Chiama, 2025-1166 (La. App. 1st Cir. 11/14/25), 2025 WL 3188031 (unpublished). In the new writ application, counsel included a “Request for Writ Extension” that was filed more than thirty days after the district court’s July 28, 2025 ruling.

Accordingly, counsel failed to comply with Rules 4-2, 4-3, and 4-5(C) (11), by failing to include documentation of a timely request for a return date and a timely request for an extension of the return date. Counsel also failed to comply with Rules 4-5(C)(5) and (9), by failing to include specifications of error and the opposition or a statement that no opposing written document was filed.

Supplementation of this writ application and/or an application for rehearing will not be considered. See Uniform Rules of Louisiana Courts of Appeal, Rules 2-18.7 & 4-9, OURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT EPUTY CLERK OF COURT FOR THE COURT

PER CURIAM.

STATE OF LOUISIANA COURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT STATE OF LOUISIANA NO. 2025 KW 1212 VERSUS CHIMEZIE J. CHIAMA DECEMBER 2, 2025 In Re: Chimezie J. Chiama, applying for supervisory writs, 21st Judicial District Court, Parish of Livingston, No. 25-TEMP-035222, BEFORE: THERIOT, PENZATO, AND BALFOUR, JJ. WRIT NOT CONSIDERED.

The prior supervisory writ application was untimely filed and counsel failed to provide an explanation for the delay. Additionally, counsel failed to include documentation showing he timely requested a return date, the return date set by the district court, and a timely request for an extension of the return date. This court provided counsel an opportunity to correct the rule violations contained in the prior supervisory writ application.

See *State v. Chiama*, 2025-1166 (La. App. 1st Cir. 11/14/25), 2025 WL 3188031 (unpublished). In the new writ application, counsel included a “Request for Writ Extension” that was filed more than thirty days after the district court’s July 28, 2025 ruling.

Accordingly, counsel failed to comply with Rules 4-2, 4-3, and 4-5(C) (11), by failing to include documentation of a timely request for a return date and a timely request for an extension of the return date. Counsel also failed to comply with Rules 4-5(C)(5) and (9), by failing to include specifications of error and the opposition or a statement that no opposing written document was filed.

Supplementation of this writ application and/or an application for rehearing will not be considered. See Uniform Rules of Louisiana Courts of Appeal, Rules 2-18.7 & 4-9, OURT OF APPEAL, FIRST CIRCUIT EPUTY CLERK OF COURT FOR THE COURT