

LAFAYETTE CITY-PARISH
CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT

15TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

VERSUS

DOCKET NO. 20216273-B

BENDEL PARTNERSHIP
(A PARTNERSHIP IN COMMENDAM)

LAFAYETTE PARISH, LOUISIANA

JUDGMENT

This matter came before the Court on the 17th day of March, 2022 on Defendant's *Motion to Dismiss Petition of Expropriation and Withdraw Funds from the Court Registry*.

Present in court were the following:

MICHAEL D. HEBERT, OMAR J. THIBEAUX, and GREGORY J. LOGAN, counsel for Plaintiff, LAFAYETTE CITY-PARISH CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT; and

RANDALL A. SMITH, PRIDE JUSTIN DORAN, and L. TIFFANY HAWKINS, counsel for Defendant, BENDEL PARTNERSHIP (A PARTNERSHIP IN COMMENDAM).

For the reasons provided in the Written Reasons for Ruling, signed this same date, LCG's Petition of Expropriation is hereby **dismissed**.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that all work upon the Bendel property cease immediately.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that costs for this matter are cast against the Plaintiff, LAFAYETTE CITY-PARISH CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT.

Signed this 4 day of May, 2022 in Lafayette, Louisiana.



VALERIE GOTCH GARRETT
JUDGE, 15th Judicial District

LAFAYETTE CITY-PARISH
CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT

15TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

VERSUS

DOCKET NO. 20216273-B

BENDEL PARTNERSHIP
(A PARTNERSHIP IN COMMENDAM)

LAFAYETTE PARISH, LOUISIANA

WRITTEN REASONS FOR RULING

This matter came before the Court on the 17th day of March, 2022 on Defendant's *Motion to Dismiss Petition of Expropriation and Withdraw Funds from the Court Registry*.

Present in court were the following:

MICHAEL D. HEBERT, OMAR J. THIBEAUX, and GREGORY J. LOGAN, counsel for Plaintiff, LAFAYETTE CITY-PARISH CONSOLIDATED GOVERNMENT; and

RANDALL A. SMITH, PRIDE JUSTIN DORAN, and L. TIFFANY HAWKINS, counsel for Defendant, BENDEL PARTNERSHIP (A PARTNERSHIP IN COMMENDAM).

The Petition of Expropriation, filed December 6, 2021, authorized Lafayette City-Parish Consolidated Government ("LCG") to expropriate the Defendants' cumulative 372.21 acres of immovable property located in Lafayette Parish for the construction of four detention ponds, known as the Homewood Drive Detention Pond Project ("Homewood Project").

FACTS

In August 2016, Louisiana experienced a torrent of rain that has since been classified as either a 500- or 1,000-year flood. This rain event caused substantial damage throughout Louisiana, particularly in Lafayette Parish and surrounding areas. Many parish and municipal agencies were thereafter prompted to allocate resources to flood prevention.

Prior to this flood event, however, a comprehensive plan for Lafayette Parish called *Plan Lafayette* had already been put together in 2014. *Plan Lafayette* identifies as one of its Policies "Protect water resources and improve stormwater management" and as one of the Actions to be taken with regard to that policy "Explore opportunities to promote regional detention planning."¹ *Plan Lafayette* further identifies Actions that have been taken or were being taken at the time of publication in furtherance of its Policies. With regard to water resources and stormwater management, Public Works worked with the Acadiana Planning Commission to propose regional detention projects for federal funding.²

¹ LCG Exhibit 4, p. LCG0520.

² LCG Exhibit 4, p. LCG0665.

Following the 2016 flood, a *Lafayette Parish Area-Wide Drainage Plan* was published in May 2017 by McBade Engineering. The *Drainage Plan* identified six categories of projects that were recommended to address stormwater management within Lafayette Parish, including “increased detention & outfall requirements” and “regional detention projects.”³ The *Drainage Plan* also included a table of “Recommended Non-Structural Activities and Structural Projects.” This table identified as an Alternative the construction of regional detention systems at several locations within Lafayette Parish, including along Coulee Ile Des Cannes in Scott. This table analyzed several aspects of each of the Alternatives, including the impact to decreased flooding, the positive impact to parish and other cities, the ability of the alternative to address the drainage issue, constructability, permitting, environmental impacts, impacts to adjacent property, and impacts to other infrastructure. Each of these factors were measured by impact on a scale of 1-5 and by weight on a scale of 1-3, with the projects with the highest total points being of greatest priority and having the most benefit to the parish. The construction of regional detention systems along Coulee Ile Des Cannes in Scott received a total score of 79 – higher than 19 other Alternatives and lower than only 4 other Alternatives.⁴ Finally, in the Recommendations section, the *Drainage Plan* states, “The projects that have the most impact on localized flooding and help areas upstream and downstream are regional detention projects.”⁵

In December 2019, the Homewood Project was identified as a project to be submitted for the Pre-Application Phase for Louisiana Watershed Initiative funding.⁶ However, that application was rejected because it exceeded the available funding. In June 2020, LCG notified Defendants that it was interested in acquiring the property, and ongoing discussions continued from that date. On September 17, 2020, LCG made a formal offer to purchase the property for \$2,580,000.

On March 9, 2021, an ordinance was introduced by LCG regarding the necessity of the Homewood Project, and a Town Hall meeting was held on March 23, 2021. At this Town Hall meeting, Pamela Granger gave a presentation that explained the Homewood Project, and members of both the community in general and the City Council expressed concerns about the Project. Specifically, Edward Abell, Jr. shared his concern that there was not yet a final engineering study to declare the Project a public necessity and requested that the ordinance be deferred for 90 days; and Peter Gauthier stated that there is a producing oil well on the property and that no study was

³ Joint Exhibit 3, p. JOINT0064.

⁴ Joint Exhibit 3, p. JOINT0113.

⁵ Joint Exhibit 3, p. JOINT0123.

⁶ Joint Exhibit 6, *in globo*.

ever conducted. Nevertheless, Joint Ordinance No. JO-012-2021 was passed. However, Josh Guillory, Lafayette Mayor-President, stated that, if the final engineering was not complete in 90 days, he would author a repeal of this ordinance.⁷

In April 2021, Professor Emad H. Habib of the University of Louisiana at Lafayette submitted to LCG a *Feasibility Assessment of Flood Mitigation Measures in Vermilion River Watershed*.⁸ The report provided the results of modeling-based assessment of different alternatives that were proposed for reducing flood risk within the Vermilion River Watershed, including two alternatives for adjusting spoil banks inside the Bayou Tortue Swamp, the construction of the Homewood detention pond along the Vermilion River, and the construction of two detention ponds on the main tributaries of Coulee Ile des Cannes. The different scenarios were evaluated during two actual storms that represented varying rainfall magnitudes and flooding impacts – May-June 2014 (a 2-10 year storm) and the August 2016 flood (a >100 year storm). The results of these assessments indicate that the Homewood detention pond reduced the maximum water stage during the August 2016 storm by an average of 0.051 feet in the Vermilion River and by an average of 0.04 feet along the Coulee Ile des Cannes tributary. Such reductions were only over a limited spatial extent of 2 miles into the coulee. By contrast, the two detention ponds on the tributaries of Coulee Ile des Cannes reduced the maximum water stage in the Vermilion River by an average of 0.1 feet during the August 2016 storm, and this reduction was observed over 32.2 miles of the Vermilion River. Compared to the Homewood detention pond, these two ponds lead to more significant reductions in maximum water surface reduction inside Coulee Ile des Cannes.

On May 5, 2021, Pamela Granger signed a contract with LCG for the Homewood Project for which she was to be compensated 6.15% of the total construction cost⁹, and on June 14, 2021, just 7 days shy of the 90-day due diligence deadline, the McBade Memo, which summarized the results of its evaluation of the Homewood Project, was delivered to LCG. The Memo, which characterizes itself as “preliminary” is certainly distinguishable from the final engineering report demanded by the community and Mayor-President Josh Guillory, yet the Ordinance was not repealed. In fact, work on the Project continued, and LCG increased McBade’s hourly rate for all projects on October 11, 2021.

⁷ Joint Exhibit 14, Joint 0058.

⁸ Joint Exhibit 5, *in globo*.

⁹ Joint Exhibit 18, Joint 0614.

By letter dated October 18, 2021, Defendants requested additional time to respond to LCG's offer. However, no substantive response was made by Defendants prior to the Petition for Expropriation. In the time between Defendants' letter and the Petition, on November 19, 2021, Pamela Granger signed the Certificate of Engineer for the Homewood Project, which was attached to the Petition for Expropriation filed on December 6, 2021, signed on December 7, 2021, and served on Defendants on December 9, 2021. Defendants timely filed the present Motions contesting the expropriation.

APPLICABLE LAW

It is well settled in Louisiana jurisprudence that there are only three issues into which a court may inquire when a property owner contests an expropriation by the State under the quick taking statute: (1) whether the property was taken for a public purpose; (2) whether the expropriating agency acted arbitrarily, capriciously, *or* in bad faith in determining the necessity of the taking; and (3) the adequacy of the compensation.¹⁰ (Emphasis added.) In the present case, Defendants are arguing only the first two issues, and they will be discussed in turn.

When a public taking is contested by the property owners, the expropriating agency must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the taking was for a public use or purpose at the time of the taking.¹¹

The Louisiana Supreme Court, quoting Corpus Juris, vol. 20, p. 551 *et seq.*, identified the somewhat differing approaches to determining public purpose:

No general definition of what degree of public good will meet the constitutional requirements for a "public use" can be framed, as it is in every case a question of public policy. The meaning of the term is flexible and is not confined to what may constitute a public use at any given time, but *in general it may be said to cover a use affecting the public generally*, or any number thereof, as distinguished from particular individuals... *The character of the use, and not its extent, determine the question of public use.*¹²

(Emphasis added.) Despite some restrictive language in the case law, "the Louisiana Jurisprudence has not defined 'public purpose' so narrowly. Rather, any allocation to a use resulting in advantages to the public at large will suffice to constitute a public purpose."¹³ Whether the expropriating agency's purpose is public and necessary is a judicial determination that will not be

¹⁰ La. R.S. 48:441 *et seq.*; La. Const. 1974, art. 1 §4; *State, Through Department of Highways v. Jeanerette Lumber and Shingle Co., Ltd.*, 350 So. 2d 847 (La. 1977); *State, Through Department of Highways v. Olinkraft, Inc.*, 350 So. 2d 865 (La. 1977), cert denied, 435 U.S. 924, 98 S. Ct. 1489, 55 L.Ed.2d 518 (1978).

¹¹ *Greater Baton Rouge Port Com'n v. Watson*, 224 La. 136, 68 So.2d 901(1953), *State Through Department of Highways v. Lessley*, 287 So. 2d 792, 796 (1973).

¹² *City of New Orleans v. New Orleans Land Co.*, 173 La. 71, 136 So. 91, 92-93 (1931).

¹³ *Town of Vidalia v. Unopened Succession of Ruffin*, 95-580 (La. App. 3 Cir. 10/4/95), 663 So. 2d 315, 319.

reversed on appeal absent manifest error.¹⁴ In the expropriation context, “necessary” refers to the necessity of the purpose for the expropriation, not the necessity for a specific location.¹⁵

Once the expropriating agency has proven the public purpose of the taking, “the landowner must prove that the legislatively-authorized expropriator exercised ‘its large discretion’ arbitrarily, capriciously, or in bad faith.”¹⁶ Once public necessity is established, the extent and the location of property to be expropriated are within the sound discretion of the expropriating agency and determination thereof will not be disturbed by the courts if made in good faith.¹⁷ The criteria to be considered by the expropriating agency in determining the location and extent of the property to be expropriated includes factors such as costs, environmental impact, long range area planning, and safety considerations.¹⁸ The standard is whether the expropriating agency, in selecting the location and extent of the property to be expropriated, acted in bad faith *or* so capriciously *or* arbitrarily that its action was without an adequate determining principle *or* was unreasoned.¹⁹

ANALYSIS

I. Public Purpose

LCG demonstrated that hundreds of FEMA claims worth millions of dollars were filed in Lafayette Parish as a result of the August 2016 flood. Further evidence was introduced as to the vulnerability of the parish to more common rain events, specifically that Lafayette Parish’s current infrastructure is built only for five-year storms. Additionally, evidence was introduced that the detention project would alleviate flooding in and throughout Lafayette Parish. Although the degree to which flooding would be reduced differs according to the source of the information, with some modeling showing a reduced water level for as much as twenty-two miles and other modeling showing a much smaller affected area, the determination of whether the property was taken for a public purpose is concerned only with the character of the use, not the extent.²⁰ Further, Defendants have produced no evidence which would suggest that flood reduction and drainage improvement does not affect the public generally. Accordingly, LCG has met its burden of proving a public use.

¹⁴ *Calcasieu-Cameron Hospital Serv. Dist. v. Fontenot*, 628 So. 2d 75, 78 (La. App. 3d Cir. 1993), *writ denied*, 94-0168 (La. 3/18/94), 634 So. 2d 854.

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ *Red River Waterway Commission v. Fredericks*, 566 So. 2d 79, 83 (La. 1990).

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Red River Waterway Commission*, 566 So. 2d at 83 (citing *U.S. v. Carmack*, 329 U.S. 230, 67 S. Ct. 252, 91 L. Ed. 209 (1946)).

¹⁹ *U.S. v. Carmack*, 329 U.S. 230 at 243.

²⁰ *City of New Orleans*, 173 La. 71 at 136.

II. Necessity of the Taking

The burden now shifts to Defendants to prove by clear and convincing evidence that LCG, in selecting the location and extent of the property to be expropriated, acted in bad faith or so capriciously or arbitrarily that its action was without an adequate determining principle or was unreasoned.²¹ The factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, costs, environmental impact, long range area planning, and safety considerations.²²

While LCG undoubtedly conducted some analyses, data collection, and modeling regarding the Homewood Detention Project, this Court finds that LCG fell short of an adequate determining principle and/or that the decision to expropriate this particular cite was arbitrarily determined.

To begin, LCG did not adequately consider other properties in selecting the location of this project. LCG points to a “heat map”²³ that was created using the claims filed as a result of the August 2016 flood to identify 90 potential locations for a detention project²⁴, each location having allegedly been “vetted” and analyzed using hydraulic models.²⁵ LCG further states that it selected the Bendel property because of its location at the confluence of two major drainage channels, namely the Vermilion River and the Coulee Ile des Cannes. Perhaps because of this location, LCG then conducted further studies of the effectiveness of the detention project *only* on the Bendel property, ignoring other possible locations, even those that were close in proximity and thus also ideally situated near these channels. Specifically, Dr. Habib’s study considers only the Homewood Detention Project that is the subject of the current location, the adjustment of spoil banks inside the Bayou Tortue Swamp, and the construction of two detention ponds on the main tributaries of Coulee Ile des Cannes.²⁶ Further modeling performed by LCG analyze only the Homewood Detention Project. None of these studies consider other possible locations for the detention ponds to the extent that the Bendel Property is considered, which suggests to this Court that LCG decided first that it would expropriate the Bendel Property and then conducted studies to support its decision. Unfortunately for LCG, those after-the-fact studies do not sufficiently justify the expropriation either. LCG relies heavily on Dr. Habib’s finding that the Homewood Detention Project would have reduced water levels during the August 2016 flood by an average of 0.051 feet in the Vermilion River and by an average of 0.04 feet along the Coulee Ile des Cannes tributary.

²¹ *Carmack*, 329 U.S. 230 at 243.

²² *Red River Waterway Commission*, 566 So. 2d at 83.

²³ Joint Exhibit 56, *in globo*.

²⁴ LCG Exhibit 16, *in globo*.

²⁵ Testimony of Pamela Granger, p. 48.

²⁶ Joint Exhibit 5, *in globo*.

At the same time, however, LCG all but ignores Dr. Habib's findings that the detention ponds on the main tributaries of the Coulee Ile des Cannes would lead to more significant reductions in the Coulee Ile des Cannes than would the Homewood Detention Project. In other words, LCG focused only on Dr. Habib's findings which supported LCG's decision to take the Bendel property, while discarding findings in the same report that suggested other projects would be more beneficial.

Next, LCG relies on its use of Construction Management At Risk (CMAR) to justify the lack of a final engineering report, even after Mayor-President Guillory stated that the ordinance for the public taking would be repealed if one was not produced. Even if CMAR was used for this project, for which only 30% of the planning and design is required, the failure to produce any engineering report, even for just those 30% plans, is inexcusable, especially in light of Mayor-President Guillory's promise to repeal the ordinance if one was not produced.

Not only did LCG fail to produce such an engineering report after publicly committing to do so – instead, submitting a self-identifying “preliminary” memo – LCG also failed to conduct appropriate preparatory analyses or to plan for the results of such analyses. At the time of the taking, LCG had not yet conducted a soil analysis, which should have been one of the first steps in this process. Although LCG argues that they were unable to conduct a soil analysis because they did not have access to the property, neither their modeling, planning, nor budget account for the unknown soil type or how different soil types would affect the overall cost, effectiveness, and/or timing of the project. Once the land was expropriated, a soil analysis conducted in December 2021 revealed that the soil on the Bendel property is very porous and not suitable for a detention project.²⁷ Thus, a thick clay or synthetic material lining is required and would create an additional cost.²⁸ While LCG attempted to distinguish between a wet pond and a dry pond, the fact remains that they did not conduct a soil analysis before the taking to determine what costs would be incurred as a result of the soil quality, nor did they make any attempt to include the variable of soil quality in their feasibility studies.

Further, although LCG's witness Pamela Granger testified that “what [Lafayette Parish] had to do was store water in places and in critical areas where there was too much volume for the topography to handle,”²⁹ the Bendel property is high and dry land and was one of very few properties that did not flood in 2016,³⁰ and therefore its topography *is* able to handle the volume

²⁷ Joint Exhibit 10, *in globo*;

²⁸ Testimony of Toby Fruge, pp. 90-91.

²⁹ Testimony of Pamela Fruge, p. 25.

³⁰ Testimony of Toby Fruge, pp. 93-94.

of water that exists during severe rain events. Due to the unusually high elevation of the Bendel Property, five feet of excavation is required just to get it to flood level, and further excavation is required to reach the desired depth of the detention ponds.³¹ As explained by Bendel's expert witness, this excavation would result in a total of 3.3 Astrodomes worth of soil, which would be very costly to transport to a disposal site, not only in terms of money for the trucks, truck drivers, and disposal site, but also in terms of the damage to the infrastructure that would result from such heavy traffic by the transportation of 528,000 trucks of dirt.³² LCG offered no evidence to refute this information, nor any evidence that it attempted to mitigate these financial and environmental costs. Had LCG adequately considered other properties, it may have realized that the property adjacent to the Bendel Property is similarly situated near both the Vermilion River and the Coulee Ile des Cannes and, unlike the Bendel Property, has a lower elevation that would be less costly to excavate.³³

Additionally, though LCG characterizes the Bendel property as "vacant," the fact remains that LCG has expropriated over 370 acres that has historically been used for agriculture, in addition to pipelines and wells, all important aspects of the local economy. Although LCG has deposited the appraised value of the land itself into the registry of the court, there does not appear to be any accounting of the cost of interfering with existing farm leases and preventing future farming on this large piece of property.

Further, LCG by its own admission only intends to use a total of 90 acres for 4 detention ponds³⁴ in addition to more land to be used for a "staging area." The staging area is only needed for the construction of the detention ponds,³⁵ and no evidence has been presented as to the purpose of expropriating the remaining 200+ acres of the Bendel property. Additionally, the detention ponds and staging area are situated in a way that the Court finds unnecessarily extends across the depth of the Bendel Property despite the availability of the length of the Bendel Property for such ponds and staging area. The Court therefore finds that LCG acted without reason and adequate determining principles particularly with respect to the extent of the property expropriated.

Lastly, and of particular concern to this Court is LCG's lack of objective analysis and peer-review. As already discussed, there have been no engineering reports, final or otherwise, submitted

³¹ Testimony of Toby Fruge, p. 98.

³² Testimony of Toby Fruge, pp. 93, 96-99.

³³ Testimony of Toby Fruge, p. 158.

³⁴ Testimony of Pamela Granger, p. 113.

³⁵ Testimony of Toby Fruge, pp. 113-114.

in connection with this project. Although LCG is using CMAR to plan for this project, such use does not in and of itself preclude the production of engineering reports to the extent of planning already done, i.e., the “30%” plans. In the modeling that LCG did perform, they used LIDAR data from the early 2000s and failed to adjust their modeling to account for changes in Lafayette Parish’s topography since that time.³⁶ Therefore the results that were produced from these models cannot and do not accurately depict the effectiveness of the proposed project.

LCG has heavily relied on the work of Pamela Granger in their planning and execution of this project, and this Court is concerned that Ms. Granger’s financial stake in this project creates a risk for biased or subjective models or interpretation of the data produced by the model. Specifically, Ms. Granger may receive up to 7% of the total construction costs of this project; thus, her pay increases with the increase of the total construction cost of the project.³⁷ Such a large financial stake in this project creates opportunities to advance Ms. Granger’s own interests. For example, Ms. Granger stated in her deposition that she alone made the decision to divide the initially-proposed singular pond into four smaller ponds.³⁸ When asked whether any other engineer or anyone in LCG verified that the four ponds are more beneficial than one, two, or three ponds, Ms. Granger responded that they “went with” her analysis.³⁹ Further, when asked who she answers to, Ms. Granger explained that she “just give[s] an update to everybody that’s in the room” at a weekly meeting,⁴⁰ suggesting that Ms. Granger calls the shots, and other involved parties merely follow suit. This is but one example of the lack of objectivity and the presence of arbitrary determinations that existed throughout the planning process of this project.

Though Ms. Granger stated on direct examination that the work was peer-reviewed,⁴¹ that peer-review was conducted by members of the C.H. Fenstermaker engineering firm.⁴² This Court finds that such peer-review was inadequate in that its ties with the proponents of the Project were inseparable from the Project itself. Not only does Fenstermaker have its own contracts with LCG, a current employee of Fenstermaker is also a former principal of the Dubroc Engineering firm, which was acquired by Ms. Granger’s firm in 2019 and has yet additional contracts with LCG.⁴³ These overlapping connections between the engineering firms combined with the firms’ existing

³⁶ Testimony of Toby Fruge, pp. 135, 161-162.

³⁷ Testimony of Pamela Granger, p. 105.

³⁸ LCG Exhibit 17 (LCG0968-0969).

³⁹ *Id.* at LCG0969.

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ Testimony of Pamela Granger, pp. 13-14.

⁴² *Id.*

⁴³ Testimony of Pamela Granger, pp. 108-109.

contracts with LCG cause the peer-review of Ms. Granger's work to be vulnerable to subjectivity and potential bias. In light of this vulnerability, this Court does not place much weight on the peer-review of Ms. Granger's work

CONCLUSION

It is of utmost priority to this Court that the rights and livelihood of local residents and businesses be protected from natural events when- and wherever possible. The financial and emotional damage of rain events is of grave concern to this Court, and potential flooding is not taken lightly. While this Court seeks to preserve the safety and property of those who have been harmed by rain events in the past, and those who are at risk for such future harm, such harm does not justify or allow for the seizing of nearly 400 acres of generational property without the necessary steps, specifically research and planning, being completed and supported.

The Court's responsibility in this matter is to look at all of the factors, the testimony of both parties' witnesses, and the facts in evidence. The Court hereby finds that LCG did meet its initial burden in proving the public purpose of detention ponds. It is all but indisputable that reducing water levels in local channels until the volume is decreased will benefit the public at large. The burden then shifts to Bendel to prove by clear and convincing evidence that the taking was arbitrary and capricious, i.e., that it was done without adequate determining principles. As explained above and shown throughout the proceedings, LCG identified 90 potential locations for the detention project, selected the Bendel property because of its location along the confluence of the Vermilion River and the Coulee Ile des Cannes, then focused its energy and attention solely on the Bendel property to justify a taking without adequately considering changes in topography, costs of excavation, or other potentially better-suited properties. Similar to the Supreme Court in *Red River Waterway Commission*, "[this Court does] not necessarily agree with the expropriating agency's decision, especially in the light of the respect due to the ownership of private property."⁴⁴ However, unlike in *Red River Waterway Commission*, it is this Court's finding that LCG "failed to consider the principles and circumstances involved in the decision or that the decision to expropriate the [Bendel property] was made arbitrarily, capriciously or in bad faith."⁴⁵

[signature on following page.]

⁴⁴ 566 So. 2d 79, 83-84 (La. 1990).

⁴⁵ *Id.*

For the foregoing reasons, the Petition for Expropriation is hereby **dismissed**.

Signed this 4 day of May, 2022 in Lafayette, Louisiana.



VALERIE GOTCH GARRETT
JUDGE, 15th Judicial District