

Judgment rendered December 3, 2025
Application for rehearing may be filed
within the delay allowed by Art. 2166,
La. C.C.P.

No. 56,543-CA
No. 56,544-CA
No. 56,545-CA
No. 56,546-CA
No. 56,547-CA
No. 56,548-CA
(Consolidated cases)

COURT OF APPEAL
SECOND CIRCUIT
STATE OF LOUISIANA

* * * * *

No. 56,548-CA

CRATELYN J. HENDERSON

Plaintiff-Appellee

versus

STEVE HOLLOWAY

Defendant-Appellant

* * * * *

Appealed from the
Forty-Second Judicial District Court for the
Parish of DeSoto, Louisiana
Trial Court No. 85,758

Honorable Amy Burford McCartney, Chief Judge

* * * * *

SMITHERMAN, HILL & BRICE, L.C.
By: F. Weber Hill

Counsel for Appellant

CRATELYN J. HENDERSON

In Proper Person

* * * * *

Before PITMAN, STEPHENS, and MARCOTTE, JJ.

STEPHENS, J., concurs in the result.

MARCOTTE, J.

These consolidated civil appeals arise out the 42nd Judicial District Court, Parish of DeSoto, the Honorable Amy Burford McCartney and the Honorable Nicholas E. Gaspar presiding. Defendant Steve Holloway (“Holloway, Sr.”) appeals the trial court’s granting of three protective orders against him. Defendant Stevie Holloway (“Stevie”) also appeals the trial court’s granting of three protective orders against him. For the following reasons, we affirm in part, reverse in part, and remand with instructions. A separate opinion is issued for each protective order. This memorandum opinion is issued in compliance with U.R.C.A. 2-16.1(B).

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 3, 2025, Cratelyn Henderson (“Henderson”) filed two petitions for protective orders against Holloway, Sr. and his son, Stevie (together “the Holloways”), alleging that, on January 1, 2025, “[Holloway, Sr.] approached me. He used profane language, shoved, and punched me. The defendant also pulled a weapon, which I perceived to be a gun, threatening my life.” He said that Stevie approached him holding a bat and threatened to harm him. Henderson said that there was a prior incident in class where Stevie threw things at him and slapped him in the head. Henderson said that, in turn, he pushed Stevie.

On January 16, 2025, Henderson filed two petitions for protection from stalking against the Holloways alleging the same facts. For a recitation of the facts and procedural history, see *Ju’Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway*, 56,543 (La. App. 2 Cir. 12/3/25).

On January 16, 2025, Judge Gasper granted a protective order in favor of Henderson against Stevie. He now appeals.

DISCUSSION

Stevie assigns the following errors:

- (1) The trial court erred in failing to apply the correct definition of stalking in accordance with La. R.S. 14:40.2.
- (2) The trial court erred in finding that Stevie represented a credible threat to the physical safety of a family member, household member, or dating partner.
- (3) The trial court erred in prohibiting the possession of a firearm for the duration of the protective order by Stevie pursuant to La. R.S. 46:2136.3.
- (4) The trial court erred in granting the protective order for a duration of two years.

For the reasons expressed in *Ju'Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway*, *supra*, Stevie's first assignment of error is without merit. The trial court was correct in issuing a protective order in favor of Henderson against him. That part of the trial court's ruling is affirmed. For the reasons articulated in *Ju'Kadynn Carter v. Steve Holloway*, *supra*, appellant's remaining assignments of error have merit. Stevie is not a family member, household member, or dating partner of Henderson's. Therefore, the trial court should not have prohibited him from possessing a firearm. That part of the trial court's ruling is reversed. The court also erred in granting the protective order for two years. We remand the case to the trial court to reduce the fixed time for the protective order to the maximum allowable period in accordance with La. R.S. 46:2136(F).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, the trial court's granting of a protective order against Stevie Holloway in favor of Cratelyn J. Henderson is affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded in accordance with this opinion. The costs of the appeal are assessed to appellant.

AFFIRMED IN PART; REVERSED IN PART; REMANDED WITH INSTRUCTIONS.