

2026 WL 1304558

UNPUBLISHED OPINION. CHECK COURT RULES BEFORE CITING.

Court of Appeal of Louisiana, Fifth Circuit.

COURTNEY JACOBS
v.
MICHELLE TIMBERLAKE

No. 26-C-184

|
May 12, 2026

Editor's Note: This decision contains discussion of citation references that are incorrect or do not actually exist. These invalid citations appeared in the original court opinion and have been preserved as written since they are part of the official record. Any links to these invalid citations have been removed.

IN RE COURTNEY JACOBS APPLYING FOR SUPERVISORY WRIT FROM THE TWENTY-FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, PARISH OF JEFFERSON, STATE OF LOUISIANA, DIRECTED TO THE HONORABLE LEE V. FAULKNER, JR., DIVISION "P", No. 736-712

Panel composed of Judges Fredericka Homberg Wicker, Marc E. Johnson, and Scott U. Schlegel

Opinion

***1 WRIT DENIED AS MOOT; RULE TO SHOW CAUSE ORDERED**

Relator, Courtney Jacobs, seeks review of the trial court's setting of a rule to show cause hearing on her "Petition to Make Foreign Orders Executory" and "Application for Civil Warrant Ordering Return of Minor Child Pursuant to Court Order." In her petition, Relator seeks to have custody orders issued by a Virginia court concerning custody of the minor, B.J., made executory in Louisiana. Relator's application for a civil warrant seeks an order for the immediate return of B.J. in accordance with the Virginia custody orders. The trial court set the rule to show cause hearing for May 12, 2026. In the instant writ application, Relator alleges that the trial court erred by setting a hearing, rather than making the Virginia

custody orders executory and enforcing them and delaying the return of B.J.

A review of the official record shows that a hearing on Relator's petition to make the foreign orders executory and application for a civil warrant was held on May 7, 2026, instead of May 12, 2026. On the same date, the trial court granted Relator's petition and took the application for a civil warrant under advisement. On May 12, 2026, the trial court granted the application for civil warrant. When considering Relator's writ application, we find the issues raised have been mooted through the trial court's rulings. Accordingly, the writ application is denied as moot.

However, we issue the following rule to show cause on our own motion.

On May 8, 2026, Respondent, Michelle Timberlake, filed a "Motion for Extension of Time to File Opposition Brief." In her motion, Respondent asserts that counsel for Relator, Courtney Jacobs, cited to legal authority in her writ application that Respondent has been unable to verify. Specifically, Respondent identifies the cited case of *Harvey v. Harvey*, 13-0253 (La. App. 4 Cir. 10/30/13), 127 So.3d 156, and represents that a search by party name and docket number did not locate the cited matter. Respondent further represents that the docket-number format cited in the application does not appear to be consistent with the Fourth Circuit's ordinary numbering conventions.

This Court has likewise been unable to locate or verify whether *Harvey v. Harvey*, 13-0253 (La. App. 4 Cir. 10/30/13), 127 So.3d 156, exists. After Respondent raised this issue, Relator filed a supplemental and amending brief to "correct the citation." However, the supplemental and amending brief does not explain why Relator removed the citation to the *Harvey* case referenced above.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Counsel for Relator, Camille Patti (Bar Roll Number 38572), show cause by brief only, to be filed not less than 48 hours from the date of receipt of this Rule to Show Cause Order, or by Monday, May 18, 2026, whichever is later,¹ why she should not be held in contempt pursuant to La. C.C.P. art. 224(4).

***2 IT IS HEREBY FURTHER ORDERED** that the brief address Relator's citation to *Harvey v. Harvey*. Counsel for

Relator shall either: 1) produce a copy of *Harvey v. Harvey*, 13-0253 (La. App. 4 Cir. 10/30/13), 127 So.3d 156; or 2) explain the source of the citation and whether the citation is erroneous. Counsel's brief shall also address whether any generative artificial intelligence tool was used in the preparation of the instant writ application and, if so, what steps Counsel took to verify the existence and validity of the legal authorities cited therein.

Gretna, Louisiana, this 12th day of May, 2026.

MEJ

FHW

SUS

FIFTH CIRCUIT

101 DERBIGNY STREET (70053)

POST OFFICE BOX 489

GRETNA, LOUISIANA 70054

www.fifthcircuit.org

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

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 **05/12/2026** 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:

CURTIS B. PURSELL CLERK OF COURT

26-C-184

E-NOTIFIED

24th Judicial District Court (Clerk)

Hon. Lee V. Faulkner, Jr. (DISTRICT JUDGE)

A. Camille Patti (Relator)

MAILED

Michelle Timberlake (Respondent)

, LA

David A. Capasso (Respondent)

Attorney at Law

650 Poydras Street

Suite 200

New Orleans, LA 70130

Olivia Marks (Relator)

Attorney at Law

Attorney at Law

3014 Metairie Road

1100 Poydras Street

Metairie, LA 70001

Suite 2900

New Orleans, LA 70163

All Citations

Stephen C. D'Antoni (Respondent)

Not Reported in So. Rptr., 2026 WL 1304558, 26-184
(La.App. 5 Cir. 5/12/26)

Footnotes

1 La. C.C.P. art. 225(A) provides, in pertinent part:

A person charged with committing a constructive contempt of a court of appeal may be found guilty thereof and punished therefor after receiving a notice to show cause, by brief, to be filed not less than forty-eight hours from the date the person receives such notice why he should not be found guilty of contempt and punished accordingly. The person so charged shall be granted an oral hearing on the charge if he submits a written request to the clerk of the appellate court within forty-eight hours after receiving notice of the charge. Such notice from the court of appeal may be sent by registered or certified mail or may be served by the sheriff.

End of Document

© 2026 Thomson Reuters. No claim to original U.S.
Government Works.