

Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal State of Louisiana

No. 26-KH-361

STATE OF LOUISIANA

versus

RAJEL JOHNSON

IN RE RAJEL JOHNSON

APPLYING FOR SUPERVISORY WRIT FROM THE TWENTY-FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF LOUISIANA, DIRECTED TO THE HONORABLE STEPHEN C. GREFER, DIVISION "J", No. 07-6335

TRUE COPY

August 10, 2026



LINDA TRAN
DEPUTY CLERK

Panel composed of Judges Susan M. Chehardy,
Jude G. Gravois, and Marc E. Johnson

WRIT DENIED

Defendant-relator, Rajel Johnson, seeks supervisory review of the trial court's Order denying his July 7, 2026 "Motion to Review Unresolved Brady Claim."¹ The trial court's July 15, 2026 Order denying relator's motion explains:

The defendant, a habitual offender, was convicted by jury of the responsive verdict of manslaughter and of armed robbery. His convictions and sentences were upheld on direct appeal. *State v. Johnson*, 11-336 (La. App. 5 Cir. 2/14/12); 91 So.3d 365. Subsequently, numerous other legal challenges, including federal habeas corpus review, have been denied.

The defendant now states that the Fifth Circuit, in an order of December 8, 2014, remanded for this court to rule on a

¹ See *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83, 83 S.Ct. 1194, 1196-97, 10 L.Ed.2d 215 (1963).

Brady claim which involved access to public records.^[2] He contends he is unable to determine if the court issued a ruling on this claim.

The record shows that on February 11, 2015, the court ordered the District Attorney to provide a written response [regarding defendant's public records request]. The District Attorney responded on March 13, 2015, representing to the court that it was "waiting on the defendant to inform whether or not he will pursue a copy of the public record requested." The answer, provided by retained counsel for the defendant, was that the request for documents was satisfied. The court issued a written ruling on March 17, 2015 that the written responses were deemed satisfactory and that any pending motions were denied.^[3] All issues in this case have been resolved by court orders, which are now final. No further relief is warranted.

Defendant's current request for review of any alleged *Brady* violation arrives more than ten years after the trial court determined that the underlying public records issues had been resolved, based on letters that the District Attorney and defendant's retained counsel submitted to the court. Defendant's July 7, 2026 "Motion to Review Unresolved Brady Claim" is filed out of time, pursuant to La. C.Cr.P. art. 930.8, and none of the exceptions to the two-year time limit specified in that article apply here.

Having received the requested records in 2015, as his counsel acknowledged, it was incumbent upon defendant to pursue further relief at that time, such as (i) requesting supervisory review of the trial court's March 17, 2015 Order stating that the public record request had been resolved and that any pending motions were "denied on the showing made as moot," or (ii) filing an application for post-conviction relief to argue the merits of the alleged *Brady* violation. Relator does not appear to have done either. Relator also sought post-conviction relief in 2021 pursuant to *Ramos v. Louisiana*, 590 U.S. --, 140 S.Ct. 1390, 206 L.Ed.2d 583 (2020), but he did not raise the *Brady* issue at that time. *See State ex rel. Rajel*

² Indeed, in 2014, relator sought post-conviction relief in this Court on a matter related to his *Brady* claim, arguing that he had not received certain records from the District Attorney's Office. This Court granted relief in part and remanded to the district court "for further proceedings pending accomplishment of relator's public records request." *See State v. Johnson*, 14-861 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/8/14) (unpublished writ disposition), *writ denied*, 15-44 (La. 5/22/15), 170 So.3d 984.

³ The March 17, 2015 Order states:

Both the assistant district attorney and defense counsel have responded in writing. Both indicate compliance with public record requests. Defense counsel states she is satisfied with the response of the District Attorney regarding a public records request.

In light of these responses, the court deems no further action necessary at this time.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED BY THE COURT that the written responses are deemed sufficient and that any pending motions are DENIED on the showing made as moot.

Johnson, 21-415 and 21-429 (La. App. 5 Cir. 7/15/21) (unpublished writ dispositions).

On the showing made, we see no error in the trial court's Order denying relator's July 7, 2026 "Motion to Review Unresolved Brady Claim." Accordingly, the writ is denied.

Gretna, Louisiana, this 10th day of August, 2026.

SMC
JGG
MEJ

SUSAN M. CHEHARDY
CHIEF JUDGE

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

JUDGES



FIFTH CIRCUIT
101 DERBIGNY STREET (70053)
POST OFFICE BOX 489
GRETN, 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 DISPOSITION CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I CERTIFY THAT A COPY OF THE DISPOSITION IN THE FOREGOING MATTER HAS BEEN TRANSMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH **UNIFORM RULES - COURT OF APPEAL, RULE 4-6** THIS DAY **08/10/2026** TO THE TRIAL JUDGE, THE TRIAL COURT CLERK OF COURT, AND AT LEAST ONE OF THE COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR EACH PARTY, AND TO EACH PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL, AS LISTED BELOW:

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Curtis B. Pursell".

CURTIS B. PURSELL
CLERK OF COURT

26-KH-361

E-NOTIFIED

24th Judicial District Court (Clerk)
Honorable Stephen C. Grefer (DISTRICT JUDGE)
Thomas J. Butler (Respondent)

MAILED

Rajel Johnson #503039 (Relator)
Rayburn Correctional Center
27268 Highway 21
Angie, LA 70426