

2019 Updates to Code of Civil Procedure

Art. 87. Repealed by Acts 2019, No. 121, §2.

Art. 192.2. Appointment of interpreter for non-English-speaking persons

A. If a non-English-speaking person who is a principal party in interest or a witness in a proceeding before the court has requested an interpreter, a judge shall appoint, after consultation with the non-English-speaking person or his attorney, a competent interpreter to interpret or to translate the proceedings to him and to interpret or translate his testimony.

B. The court shall order payment to the interpreter for his services at a fixed reasonable amount, and that amount shall be paid out of the appropriate court fund, except as provided in Paragraph C of this Article. The amount paid out of the fund may be taxed by the court as costs of court to be reimbursed to the fund.

C. In a proceeding alleging abuse under R.S. 46:2134 et seq., an interpreter if necessary shall be appointed prior to a rule to show cause hearing.

Acts 2008, No. 882, §1; Acts 2019, No. 406, §1, eff. June 20, 2019.

Art. 2334. Reading of advertisement and certificates

A. At the time and place designated for the sale, the sheriff shall read aloud the advertisement describing the property. The sheriff shall also read aloud a mortgage certificate and any other certificate required by law or otherwise provide, at least twenty-four hours prior to the sale, a copy of such certificates to the public by means of public posting, written copies, electronic means, or by any other method.

B. The failure of the sheriff to procure, read aloud, or provide a copy of any certificate as required by this Article shall not impact the validity of the sale and shall not give rise to any cause of action against the sheriff, the seizing creditor, or the purchaser arising out of such failure.

Amended by Acts 2019, No. 415, §1.

Art. 4521. Payments to minor

A. In approving any proposal by which a minor is to be paid funds as the result of a judgment or settlement, the court may order:

(1) That the funds be paid directly into the registry of the court for the minor's account, to be withdrawn only upon approval of the court. Withdrawn funds shall be invested directly in an interest-bearing investment as approved by the court unless the court for good cause approves another disposition.

(2) That the funds be invested directly in an interest-bearing investment approved by the court, unless the court for good cause approves another disposition.

(3) That the funds be placed in trust in accordance with the Louisiana Trust Code to be administered by an individual or corporate trustee as determined by the court. However, the court shall not order funds which will be paid to an unemancipated minor who is in the legal custody of the Department of Children and Family Services to be placed in trust if the amount of the judgment or settlement is less than fifty thousand dollars.

(4) That the funds be paid under a structured settlement agreement as approved by the court that provides for periodic payments and is underwritten by a financially responsible entity that assumes responsibility for future payments.

(5) Any combination of Subparagraphs (1) through (4) of this Paragraph.

B. In determining whether a proposed periodic payment schedule is in the best interest of the minor, the court shall consider the following factors:

- (1) Age and life expectancy of the minor.
- (2) Current and anticipated financial needs of the minor.
- (3) Income and estate tax implications.
- (4) Impact on eligibility for government benefits.
- (5) Present value of the proposed payment arrangement and the method by which the value is calculated.

Added by Acts 1984, No. 296, §1; Acts 2008, No. 716, §1; Acts 2015, No. 260, §2, eff. Jan. 1, 2016; Acts 2018, No. 607, §1; Acts 2019, No. 17, §§1, 2, eff. May 24, 2019.

Art. 4843. City court jurisdiction; amount in dispute; injunctive actions by state or political subdivision

A. Except as otherwise provided for in this Article, the civil jurisdiction of a city court is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars.

B. The civil jurisdiction of a city court in which the population of the territorial jurisdiction is greater than fifty thousand is concurrent with the district court in cases or proceedings instituted by the state, a parish, a municipality, or other political subdivision of the state for injunctive relief or other civil relief for the cessation or abatement of any acts or practices which may violate a parish or municipal ordinance or state law. In such case, the court has jurisdiction regardless of the amount in dispute or the value of the property involved.

C. In the City Court of Bossier City, and any city court in which the population of the territorial jurisdiction is less than fifty thousand, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the civil jurisdiction is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed fifteen thousand dollars.

D. In the City Court of Houma and the City Court of Lafayette, the civil jurisdiction is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed twenty thousand dollars.

E. In the City Court of Bogalusa, the City Court of Bunkie, the City Court of Eunice, the City Court of Marksville, the City Court of Natchitoches, a city court in New Orleans, the City Court of Opelousas, the City Court of Port Allen, the City Court of Sulphur, the City Court of Ville Platte, and the City Court of Winnsboro, the civil jurisdiction is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed twenty-five thousand dollars.

F. In the City Court of Breaux Bridge, the City Court of Crowley, the City Court of Hammond, the City Court of Jeanerette, the City Court of Jennings, the City Court of New Iberia, the City Court of Monroe, the City Court of Oakdale, the City Court of Rayne, and the City Court of Winnfield, the civil jurisdiction is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed thirty thousand dollars.

G. In the City Court of Abbeville, the City Court of Baker, the City Court of Baton Rouge, the City Court of Kaplan, the City Court of Leesville, the City Court of Minden, the City Court of Plaquemine, the City Court of Shreveport, the City Court of Springhill, and the City Court of Zachary, the civil jurisdiction is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed thirty-five thousand dollars.

H. In the City Court of Alexandria, the Third Ward City Court of Franklin, the City Court of Pineville, the City Court of Slidell, the City Court of Ruston, and the City Court of Lake Charles, the civil jurisdiction is concurrent with the district court in cases where the amount in dispute, or the value of the property involved, does not exceed fifty thousand dollars.

Acts 1986, No. 539, §1; Acts 1986, No. 924, §1; Acts 1988, No. 75, §1; Acts 1988, No. 314, §1; Acts 1990, No. 186, §1; Acts 1990, No. 504, §1, eff. July 18, 1990; Acts 1992, No. 10, §1; Acts 1992, No. 939, §1; Acts 1993, No. 541, §1; Acts 1995, No. 126, §1; Acts 1995, No. 204, §1; Acts 1995, No. 311, §1, eff. June 16, 1995; Acts 1995, No. 466, §1; Acts 1997, No. 193, §1, eff. Jan. 1, 1998; Acts 1997, No. 323, §1; Acts 1997, No. 407, §1; Acts 1999, No. 504, §1, eff. Jan. 1, 2000; Acts 1999, No. 644, §1; Acts 1999, No. 694, §1; Acts 2001, No. 255, §1; Acts 2001, No. 343, §1, eff. Jan. 1, 2001; Acts 2001, No. 357, §1; Acts 2001, No. 762, §1, eff. June 25, 2001; Acts 2002, 1st Ex. Sess., No. 58, §1; Acts 2003, No. 153, §1; Acts 2003, No. 276, §1; Acts 2003, No. 435, §1; Acts 2003, No. 436, §1; Acts 2003, No. 601, §1; Acts 2003, No. 905, §2; Acts 2003, No. 1213, §1; Acts 2004, No. 205, §1; Acts 2004, No. 487, §1; Acts 2004, No. 511, §1; Acts 2004, No. 538, §1; Acts 2004, No. 539, §1; Acts 2004, No. 714, §1; Acts 2005, No. 31, §1; Acts 2005, No. 109, §1; Acts 2005, No. 349, §1; Acts 2005, No. 353, §1; Acts 2006, No. 365, §1; Acts 2006, No. 379, §1; Acts 2006, No. 575, §1; Acts 2006, No. 680, §1; Acts 2006, No. 681, §1; Acts 2008, No. 44, §1; Acts 2010, No. 161, §1; Acts 2010, No. 180, §1; Acts 2010, No. 228, §1; Acts 2011, No. 88, §1; Acts 2011, No. 103, §1, eff. June 20, 2011; Acts 2012, No. 166, §1; Acts 2012, No. 331, §1; Acts 2013, No. 68, §1; Acts 2014, No. 363, §1; Acts 2014, No. 843, §1; Acts 2015, No. 367, §1; Acts 2015, No. 461, §1, eff. July 1, 2015; Acts 2019, No. 135, §1.

Art. 5059. Computation of time

A. In computing a period of time allowed or prescribed by law or by order of court, the date of the act, event, or default after which the period begins to run is not to be included. The last day of the period is to be included, unless it is a legal holiday, in which event the period runs until the end of the next day which is not a legal holiday.

B. A half-holiday is considered as a legal holiday. A legal holiday is to be included in the computation of a period of time allowed or prescribed, except when:

- (1) It is expressly excluded;
- (2) It would otherwise be the last day of the period; or
- (3) The period is less than seven days.

C.(1) A legal holiday shall be excluded in the computation of a period of time allowed or prescribed to seek rehearing, reconsideration, or judicial review or appeal of a decision or order by an agency in the executive branch of state government.

(2) Subparagraph (1) of this Paragraph shall not apply to the computation of a period of time allowed or prescribed to seek rehearing, reconsideration, or judicial review or appeal of a decision or order by the Department of Revenue, the Department of Environmental Quality, or the Department of Insurance relative to examination reports in R.S. 22:1983.

Acts 2018, No. 128, §1; Acts 2019, No. 300, §1.