

Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal
State of Louisiana

No. 25-KA-518

STATE OF LOUISIANA

versus

IRIELLE A LOVE

ON APPEAL THE TWENTY-FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
PARISH OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF LOUISIANA
NO. 21-344, DIVISION "E"
HONORABLE FRANK A. BRINDISI, JUDGE PRESIDING

August 26, 2026

FREDERICKA HOMBERG WICKER
JUDGE

Panel composed of Judges Fredericka Homberg Wicker,
John J. Molaison, Jr., and Scott U. Schlegel

AFFIRMED; FINE VACATED ON COUNT TWO

FHW
JJM
SUS



COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLANT,
IRIELLE A. LOVE

Remy V. Starns
Justin C. Harrell

COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFF/APPELLEE,
STATE OF LOUISIANA

Honorable Paul D. Connick, Jr.
Thomas J. Butler
Darren A. Allemand
Taylor Somerville
Eric C. Cusimano

WICKER, J.

Defendant Irielle A. Love appeals her convictions for second degree murder and obstruction of justice. For the following reasons, we affirm her convictions and vacate the fine imposed as part of her sentence on count two.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 1, 2021, a Jefferson Parish Grand Jury indicted Defendant on charges of second degree murder in violation of La. R.S. 14:30.1 and obstruction of justice in violation of La. R.S. 14:130.1. Defendant pled not guilty at her April 9, 2021 arraignment. The case proceeded to trial on June 16, 2025. On June 18, 2025, a twelve-person jury found Defendant guilty on both counts. On June 30, 2025, after hearing victim impact statements, the trial court sentenced Defendant to life imprisonment at hard labor without benefit of parole, probation, or suspension of sentence on count one and to a consecutive forty-year term at hard labor plus a \$100,000 fine on count two. The same day, Defendant filed a notice of appeal, which the trial court granted on July 7, 2025. This appeal timely followed.

ISSUE RAISED ON APPEAL

On appeal, Defendant argues the evidence adduced by the State at trial was insufficient to support her second degree murder conviction and that the State failed to exclude every reasonable hypothesis of innocence.

FACTS ESTABLISHED AT TRIAL

In order to properly address the issue raised by Defendant on appeal, we review the trial testimony and evidence introduced by the State in detail.

On December 1, 2020, Dory Sierra was killed at her apartment in the Preston Place apartment complex located at 3320 Edenborn Avenue in Metairie, Louisiana. At trial, the State called twelve witnesses.

Dores Reyes

Dores Reyes, the victim's daughter, testified that she lived with her mother in Apartment 205-E. On December 1, 2020, she came home after 2:00 p.m. and found her mother dead in the bathtub. She went downstairs and notified the property manager, Jenifer Deleon, and then called 9-1-1. Ms. Deleon helped her cover her mother's body in the tub. Ms. Reyes testified she spoke with detectives from the Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office (JPSO). She later discovered that her mother's cell phone and \$280 in cash were missing from the apartment and reported the missing items to detectives.

Rene Reyes

Rene Reyes, the victim's son, testified that he spoke with his mother by phone on the morning of December 1, 2020 and noticed nothing unusual. Later that day, his sister Dores Reyes called him in a panic. He testified that he went to his mother's apartment, where he found her lying in the bathtub in blood. He later spoke with detectives and provided a DNA sample at their request.

Jenifer Deleon

Jenifer Deleon, the property manager, testified that she knew the victim and her daughter, who had lived together at the apartment complex for about twenty years. She saw the victim on the morning of December 1, 2020. The same morning at 9:30 a.m., three people had scheduled an apartment tour: Defendant, Defendant's grandmother (Etta Love), and Defendant's mother. Ms. Deleon testified that prospective tenants must have an ID to tour the premises, but only Defendant's grandmother and mother had their IDs; therefore, they were permitted to tour the premises, but Defendant was not. Ms. Deleon testified that Defendant nevertheless joined the tour of the model apartment despite lacking her ID. Ms. Deleon did not give the tour herself. She testified that she saw Defendant and her family in the leasing office but was busy in her own office and did not observe any odd behavior.

After the tour, Defendant's grandmother decided to lease the apartment and left with Defendant's mother to get a money order. Ms. Deleon testified that while they were away, Defendant reappeared at the leasing office. Ms. Deleon could not recall noticing any blood on Defendant. Once Defendant's grandmother and mother returned, they completed the lease application and left the premises around mid-afternoon. Ms. Deleon testified that Ms. Reyes came into the leasing office sometime later, acting hysterical and told Ms. Deleon that her mother was dead. Ms. Deleon went to the apartment with Ms. Reyes and covered the victim's body with a blanket. She later met with detectives and gave them surveillance video from the complex.

Nancy Clary

Two 9-1-1 calls were admitted into evidence through the testimony of Nancy Clary, the custodian of records for the JPSO. In the first—which was received at 2:57 p.m. on December 1, 2020—the caller identified herself as Doris Reyes and said her mother had fallen in the bathtub and died. In the second, Jenifer Deleon called to report the death of a resident in apartment 205-E.

Etta Love

Etta Love, Defendant's grandmother, testified that she lived with Defendant in Kenner, Louisiana, and that they were scheduled to attend an eviction hearing on the afternoon of December 1, 2020. Ms. Love explained that, because of their pending eviction, they planned to tour an apartment at the Preston Place apartment complex in Metairie, Louisiana that morning. Defendant's mother drove Defendant and Ms. Love to the apartment tour in a rental car. Ms. Love explained that she provided her ID for the apartment tour, but Defendant did not because Defendant's name would not be on the lease. Following the apartment tour, Ms. Love and Defendant's mother left to get a money order; they left without Defendant because she was standing outside and they did not want to wait for her. Ms. Love testified

that the trip took about fifteen to twenty minutes. She could not recall if Defendant's mother received phone calls from Defendant while they were gone.

When they got back to the complex, Ms. Love did not know where Defendant was. Ms. Love testified that they left the complex about ten minutes after returning and saw Defendant walking about a block away on West Esplanade. She said that Defendant appeared confused, and Defendant stated that she had gotten out of a car she thought was her mother's. When they picked Defendant up, she was wearing the same clothes as that morning, though Ms. Love could not remember whether she had a bag with her. Thereafter, they all went to Kenner for the eviction hearing, then returned to Ms. Love's apartment. Ms. Love described Defendant as acting irrational and nervous. Because Ms. Love had to go to work at University Medical Center (UMC) and was concerned about how Defendant was acting, Ms. Love called Defendant's mother and suggested that Defendant check into the hospital. Defendant's mother dropped them off at UMC around 3:30 p.m., and Defendant checked herself into the psychiatric ward. Ms. Love testified that she gave multiple statements to detectives about Defendant. She recalled telling them that Defendant carried pepper spray in a pink container on her keychain; although she did not recall seeing Defendant carrying it on December 1, 2020.

Dr. Ellen Connor

Dr. Ellen Connor, who was accepted as an expert in forensic pathology, conducted the victim's autopsy. She testified that the manner of death was homicide caused by multiple sharp force injuries to the neck and torso. She identified ten sharp force injuries in all: three incised wounds and seven stab wounds. Dr. Connor explained that both stab wounds and incised wounds are sharp force injuries made with an object that has a sharp edge coming to a point, likely a double-edged weapon. She distinguished the two types of wounds, describing a stab wound as deeper than it is wide and an incised wound as wider than it is deep. The victim also had blunt

force injuries to the head, neck, and torso, along with bruises on her arms and legs.

Dr. Connor testified that the victim did not have any defensive wounds.

Dr. Timothy Scanlan

Dr. Timothy Scanlan, who was accepted as an expert in crime scene reconstruction and bloodstain pattern analysis, testified that significant bloodshed on the floor near the bathroom sink indicated that the bloodletting injuries began at that location. He said photographs showed the rest of the home appearing undisturbed, reflecting a focused, deliberate attack in the bathroom. He testified that diluted blood recovered, and bloodstained towels and paper towels found in the kitchen sink, were consistent with a cleanup attempt or someone wiping blood off themselves. He concluded that the blood patterns and pepper spray near the bathroom sink indicated the victim was attacked with a knife and pepper-sprayed simultaneously.

Kortnie Layrisson

Kortnie Layrisson, who was accepted as an expert in latent print processing and comparison, testified that she analyzed the fingerprints collected from the interior of the victim's apartment door and that they were matched to Defendant through the Automated Fingerprint Identification System.

Sergeant Anthony Buttone

Sergeant Anthony Buttone, who was accepted as an expert in call detail records and geolocation analysis, testified that he arrived at the scene around 4:00 p.m. on December 1, 2020. He observed a large amount of blood on the bathroom floor and in the bathtub, with the victim half in and half out of the tub under a blanket. Crime scene personnel photographed the scene and collected fingerprints. The following day, Sergeant Buttone learned that fingerprints from the interior of the victim's door were identified as Defendant's. The victim's family said they did not know Defendant or why her fingerprints were inside the apartment.

A database check produced an address on Martinique Street in Kenner. Sergeant Buttone testified that a search warrant was executed there, and eviction paperwork in Defendant's grandmother's (Etta Love) name was found. Sergeant Buttone spoke with Ms. Love by phone and met with her at UMC. She told detectives that she, Defendant, and Defendant's mother had been at Preston Place on the morning of December 1 and that Defendant was admitted to UMC that same day.

Sergeant Buttone testified that Ms. Reyes told detectives the victim's cell phone was missing from the apartment. Detectives then obtained the victim's phone records on December 2 and located the phone at an apartment complex on Kent Avenue near the intersection of Kent and West Esplanade. Geolocation data showed both Defendant's and the victim's phones at the Preston Place address between 9:42 a.m. and 10:36 a.m. on December 1, 2020. After the suspected time of the murder, both phones moved to the Kent Avenue area, with Defendant's phone pinging at 11:21 a.m. and the victim's at 11:22 a.m. Defendant's phone then moved to the Kenner courthouse at about 11:55 a.m., while the victim's phone stayed on Kent Avenue. Defendant's phone later moved to UMC at 2:25 p.m. Sergeant Buttone also testified that on December 3, 2020 the leasing agent at Preston Place identified photos of Defendant, her mother, and her grandmother as the people who had been at the apartment complex on the morning of December 1, 2020.

Detective Thomas Gai

Detective Thomas Gai, then-sergeant of the homicide division of JPSO, testified that he responded to the scene at Preston Place. He interviewed the victim's son and daughter, and detectives did not consider either of them a murder suspect. He testified that geolocation data placed the victim's cell phone around Kent Avenue, and based on that, detectives obtained a search warrant for the apartment at 4405 Kent Avenue. There, they found the victim's cell phone at the bottom of a

trash can in the backyard. The phone was processed but no fingerprints were recovered from it.

After learning that Defendant's fingerprints were found on the door of the victim's apartment and that Defendant was at UMC, detectives obtained a warrant to collect her clothing, cell phone, and other evidence in her possession, including a set of keys with a pink pepper spray holder, a pink purse, and a red backpack. Defendant did not have any defensive wounds. Detective Gai testified that both Defendant's mother and grandmother told detectives they knew Defendant to carry pepper spray on her keys. He further testified that, although there was no evidence of blood or pepper spray on Defendant, there was evidence of a cleanup at the victim's apartment, and the time period between the murder on December 1 and Defendant's arrest on December 3 gave Defendant ample opportunity to wash evidence off herself.

Detective Dustin Ducote

Detective Dustin Ducote performed extractions on several devices, including Defendant's cell phone, which revealed numerous calls made between Defendant's phone and her mother's phone between 10:25 a.m. and 11:51 a.m. It also revealed a message sent from Defendant's phone at 11:58 a.m. stating, "my own momma set me up, don't trust her or grams," but Detective Ducote admitted that he could not identify who the message was sent to.

Detective Harold Wischan

Detective Harold Wischan testified that he responded to the scene at Preston Place on December 1 and attended the victim's autopsy on December 2. The autopsy determined that the victim sustained ten stab wounds and had contusions and bruises on her extremities. The back of her head, her face, and her upper neck were stained with an orange-colored substance. Swabs were collected, and the substance was determined to be pepper spray. Detective Wischan recalled that an orange substance

was also found in the bathroom of the victim's apartment where her body was located, and that Defendant's grandmother had told detectives Defendant carried pepper spray on her keys.

Detective Wischan obtained surveillance footage of the Preston Place apartments from December 1, 2020. The footage showed Defendant, her grandmother, and her mother meeting with the leasing agent. In the video, Defendant wore black pants with a white stripe, a sweatshirt, a red backpack, and a mask. At about 9:49 a.m., Defendant, her grandmother, and her mother walked into the model apartment with the leasing agent. The three later walked out, and Defendant turned around to go back in. Her mother went back inside, and she and Defendant walked out. Defendant then went into the model apartment again and walked out, followed by the leasing agent. At about 10:00 a.m., Defendant was seen walking out of the leasing office alone and trying to re-enter, but she could not get in because the door was locked. She then wandered the outdoor hallways and looked up at the cameras. Another person walked into view, and Defendant went out of view. She was then seen opening a maintenance closet and walking back toward the model apartment. At about 10:23 a.m., the surveillance cameras lost sight of her. She reappeared thirty minutes later, at 10:57 a.m. Detective Wischan noted that a lighter-colored shirt was sticking out under her sweatshirt and that her black pants were rolled up. She walked back into view and was seen calling someone. She then walked back toward the model apartment at about 10:58 a.m.

Detective Wischan obtained an arrest warrant and Defendant was arrested on December 3. On December 4, Defendant waived her rights and gave a statement to Detective Wischan. She admitted being at Preston Place with her mother and grandmother on December 1 and said her mother wanted her to kill her grandmother. She confirmed that she viewed the model apartment with her grandmother and mother, that she went back in while the leasing agent was inside, and that the leasing

agent told her not to kill or hurt her. Defendant said she was scared and walked back home. She said she could not find her grandmother and mother and kept asking the people in the leasing office where they were. She said she walked to Esplanade to a Shell gas station. She denied going onto the second floor of the complex and denied knowing who the victim was. She said “they” had told her that her grandmother’s apartment would be on the second floor, but “she” kept showing them the model. Defendant repeated that her mother wanted her to kill her grandmother, and then said someone at the Shell gas station had threatened her. Defendant confirmed that she wore black athletic pants that day but did not have a bag or purse. She confirmed that she had carried pepper spray on her keychain in the past and said she did not carry a knife. When asked why her fingerprints were in the victim’s apartment, she replied that she did not know why she was even in this situation. She said she was on West Esplanade when she got into a car she thought was her mother’s, near a car wash, and that the man in the car wanted her to have sex with him for money and said he knew human traffickers. She said she got out of the car and called her mother to pick her up, but her mother said she was at Walmart and needed to go to court, and that she called her mother multiple times. When Detective Wischan asked what she did with the victim’s cell phone and where she put it, she answered, “no.” She denied knowing anything about the victim.

After the interview, Defendant was booked for second degree murder and obstruction of justice. Detectives located and collected the black pants suspected to have been worn on the day of the murder from Defendant’s house on Martinique. Surveillance footage from the Shell gas station on West Esplanade was obtained, showing an individual with rolled-up black pants, a faint outline of a red backpack, and a light-colored shirt walking toward Kenner. Detective Wischan said it appeared that Defendant had removed her sweatshirt. He testified that, based on Defendant’s

statement, detectives tried to obtain surveillance footage from the Pelican Point car wash, but the cameras were not facing the street.

Considering all the testimony and physical evidence, the jury found Defendant guilty of the second degree murder of Dory Sierra and obstruction of justice.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

As stated above, on appeal, Defendant argues the evidence was insufficient to support her second degree murder conviction and that the State failed to exclude every reasonable hypothesis of innocence. She contends that, aside from her fingerprints placing her in the victim's apartment, there was no direct or forensic evidence linking her to the murder, and the surveillance footage and timeline were inconsistent with her committing the crime. Defendant maintains that the evidence suggests she inadvertently stumbled upon a murder scene and, at most, committed a burglary. The State responds that Defendant's fingerprints inside the victim's apartment, cell phone records showing her movement with the victim's phone, and surveillance footage supported the conviction. The State also argues that the jury heard and rejected the defense's arguments about the lack of DNA and other forensic evidence when it found Defendant guilty. In reply, Defendant argues that the State's theory is speculative and that the absence of direct or forensic evidence supports her innocence, making the jury's verdict irrational and unsupported by the record.

The constitutional standard for sufficiency of the evidence is whether, upon viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, any rational trier of fact could find that the State proved all essential elements of the crime beyond a reasonable doubt. *Jackson v. Virginia*, 443 U.S. 307, 99 S.Ct. 2781, 61 L.Ed.2d 560 (1979); *see also State v. Lirette*, 25-572 (La. App. 5 Cir. 3/27/26), 433 So.3d 1117, 1125–26 (citing *State v. Magee*, 24-435 (La. App. 5 Cir. 7/16/25), 420 So.3d 158, 173). Inherent to proving the elements of an offense is proving the identity of the defendant as the perpetrator. *State v. Salvant*, 24-205 (La. App. 5 Cir. 3/19/25), 411

So.3d 74, 89, *writ denied*, 25-485 (La. 9/16/25), 416 So.3d 473. The State must negate any reasonable probability of misidentification. *Id.*

Evidence may be either direct or circumstantial. Circumstantial evidence consists of proof of collateral facts and circumstances from which the existence of the main fact can be inferred according to reason and common experience. *Lirette*, 433 So.3d at 1125. When circumstantial evidence is used to prove the commission of an offense, La. R.S. 15:438 mandates that “assuming every fact to be proved that the evidence tends to prove, in order to convict, it must exclude every reasonable hypothesis of innocence.” *Id.* This is not a separate test from the standard set forth in *Jackson* but rather provides a helpful basis for determining the existence of reasonable doubt in cases involving circumstantial evidence. *Id.* All evidence, both direct and circumstantial, must be sufficient to support the conclusion that the defendant is guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. *Magee*, 420 So.3d at 173 (citing to *State v. Wooten*, 99-181 (La. App. 5 Cir. 6/1/99), 738 So.2d 672, 675, *writ denied*, 99-2057 (La. 1/14/00), 753 So.2d 208).

The reviewing court must defer to the trier of fact’s rational credibility calls, evidence weighing, and inference drawing and may not overturn a verdict based on an exculpatory hypothesis of innocence presented to, and rationally rejected by, the jury. *State v. Monterroso*, 22-390 (La. App. 5 Cir. 4/26/23), 361 So.3d 1177, 1189, *writ denied*, 23-745 (La. 11/21/23), 373 So.3d 447. Indeed, the resolution of conflicting testimony rests solely with the trier of fact, who may accept or reject, in whole or in part, the testimony of any witness. *State v. Lavigne*, 22-282 (La. App. 5 Cir. 5/24/23), 365 So.3d 919, 940. Thus, in the absence of internal contradiction or irreconcilable conflict with physical evidence, the testimony of a single witness, if believed by the trier of fact, is sufficient to support a conviction. *State v. Sly*, 23-60 (La. App. 5 Cir. 11/2/23), 376 So.3d 1047, 1072, *writ denied*, 23-1588 (La. 4/23/24), 383 So.3d 608.

In the present case, Defendant was convicted of second degree murder, which is defined, in pertinent part, as the killing of a human being when the offender has the specific intent to kill or to inflict great bodily harm, or is engaged in the perpetration or attempted perpetration of one of several enumerated felonies, even though she has no intent to kill or to inflict great bodily harm. La. R.S. 14:30.1; *see State v. Sly*, 376 So.3d at 1072. The written jury charges, signed by the trial judge, reflect that the jury was informed that it could convict Defendant under the first theory of second degree murder. Specific intent is “that state of mind which exists when the circumstances indicate that the offender actively desired the prescribed criminal consequences to follow his act or failure to act.” La. R.S. 14:10(1). Such a state of mind can be formed in an instant. *Sly*, 376 So.3d at 1073. Specific intent may be inferred from the circumstances surrounding the offense and the conduct of the defendant, as well as the extent and severity of the victim’s injuries. The determination of whether the requisite intent is present is a question of fact, and a review of the correctness of this determination is guided by the *Jackson* standard. *Id.*

This Court has previously upheld a second degree murder conviction based on circumstantial evidence. In *State v. Miller*, 20-182 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/23/20), 308 So.3d 1246, 1256, *writ denied*, 21-233 (La. 4/27/21), 314 So.3d 838, this Court upheld a second degree murder conviction based on missing items belonging to one of the victims (that the defendant’s girlfriend testified were in the defendant’s possession upon his return from New Orleans), cell phone records and Facebook communications between the defendant and one of the victims, the defendant’s possession of one of the victim’s vehicles, and testimony as to the defendant’s travel to New Orleans from Baton Rouge. We found that the jury clearly found the evidence presented by the State was credible and rejected the defendant’s version of events. *Id.* at 1255-56. In further support of our holding, we explained that:

We note that this Court has previously upheld a second degree murder conviction based on circumstantial evidence. In *State v. Cochran*, 09-85 (La. App. 5 Cir. 6/23/09), 19 So.3d 497, 505, *writ denied*, 09-1742 (La. 3/26/10), 29 So.3d 1249, this Court found that the lack of direct, physical evidence notwithstanding, the State presented circumstantial evidence that was sufficient to prove the defendant was the person who killed the victim, noting that the defendant was seen in close proximity with items belonging to the victim after the homicide.

Id. at 1256 n.11.

In the instant case, considering the evidence—particularly the fingerprint evidence linking Defendant to the victim’s apartment; the cell phone evidence showing Defendant’s movements in sync with the movements of the victim’s cell phone; the pepper spray, which Defendant was known to carry, found on the victim; and the surveillance footage—we find that a rational trier of fact could have found that the evidence was sufficient under the *Jackson* standard to support Defendant’s conviction of second degree murder. This assignment of error is without merit.

Errors Patent Review

We reviewed the record for errors patent pursuant to La. C.Cr.P. art. 920; *State v. Oliveaux*, 312 So.2d 337 (La. 1975); and *State v. Weiland*, 556 So.2d 175 (La. App. 5 Cir. 1990); and found one error. As part of Defendant’s sentence for obstruction of justice, the trial court imposed a \$100,000 fine. Pursuant to La. C.Cr.P. art. 875.1, the trial court is required to conduct a hearing to determine whether payment of any fine, fee, cost, restitution, or monetary obligation would cause substantial financial hardship to the defendant or her dependents. Here, there is no indication in the record that the trial court conducted a hearing or that Defendant waived this judicial determination. Accordingly, we vacate the fine imposed on Defendant as part of her sentence on count two. *See State v. Chest*, 24-199 (La. App. 5 Cir. 2/26/25), 406 So.3d 684, 701, *writ denied*, 25-387 (La. 5/20/25), 409 So.3d 222. We decline, however, to remand the matter for a financial feasibility hearing, as such a hearing would be futile given that Defendant is serving a life

sentence and will have no ability to pay any fine. *State v. Gelpi*, 25-58 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/10/25), 428 So.3d 743, 759.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm Defendant's convictions and vacate the fine imposed as part of her sentence on count two.

AFFIRMED; FINE VACATED ON COUNT TWO

SUSAN M. CHEHARDY
CHIEF JUDGE

FREDERICKA H. WICKER
JUDE G. GRAVOIS
MARC E. JOHNSON
STEPHEN J. WINDHORST
JOHN J. MOLAISON, JR.
SCOTT U. SCHLEGEL
TIMOTHY S. MARCEL

JUDGES



FIFTH CIRCUIT
101 DERBIGNY STREET (70053)
POST OFFICE BOX 489
GRETNA, LOUISIANA 70054
www.fifthcircuit.org

CURTIS B. PURSELL
CLERK OF COURT

SUSAN S. BUCHHOLZ
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

LINDA M. TRAN
FIRST DEPUTY CLERK

MELISSA C. LEDET
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL STAFF

(504) 376-1400
(504) 376-1498 FAX

NOTICE OF JUDGMENT AND CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I CERTIFY THAT A COPY OF THE OPINION IN THE BELOW-NUMBERED MATTER HAS BEEN DELIVERED
IN ACCORDANCE WITH **UNIFORM RULES - COURT OF APPEAL, RULE 2-16.4 AND 2-16.5** THIS DAY
AUGUST 26, 2026 TO THE TRIAL JUDGE, CLERK OF COURT, COUNSEL OF RECORD AND ALL PARTIES
NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL, AS LISTED BELOW:

CURTIS B. PURSELL
CLERK OF COURT

25-KA-518

E-NOTIFIED

24TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (CLERK)
HONORABLE FRANK A. BRINDISI (DISTRICT JUDGE)
JUSTIN C. HARRELL (APPELLANT)
HONORABLE PAUL D. CONNICK, JR.
(APPELLEE)

MICHAEL A. MITCHELL (APPELLANT)
THOMAS J. BUTLER (APPELLEE)
REMY V. STARNES (APPELLANT)

DARREN A. ALLEMAND (APPELLEE)
ERIC C. CUSIMANO (APPELLEE)
TAYLOR SOMERVILLE (APPELLEE)

MAILED

NO ATTORNEYS WERE MAILED