

**STATE OF LOUISIANA
COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND CIRCUIT
430 Fannin Street
Shreveport, LA 71101
(318) 227-3700**

No. 56,858-CW

LOUIS DANIEL HAYNES, INDIVIDUALLY,
AND AS THE SURVING SON OF LOUIS FLANIGAN,
DECEASED, AND SHERRY Y. SAMUELS, INDIVIDUALLY,
AND AS THE SURVIVING DAUGHTER OF
INELL N. FLANIGAN, DECEASED,
IN SOLIDO

VERSUS

OMNI ENERGY TRANSPORTATION CORP., OMNI ENERGY SERVICES
CORP., CHARLES HOLSTON, INC., DANIEL PARKS,
STARR INDEMNITY & LIABILITY COMPANY, JACKIE OWENS,
OWENS TRUCKING, LLC, PROGRESSIVE INSURANCE COMPANY,
BRANDON WADE, AGGREGATE TRANSPORT SERVICE, LLC.,
HOUSTON SPECIALTY INSURANCE COMPANY
IN SOLIDO

FILED: 12/16/25

RECEIVED: E-FILED 12/15/25

On application of Louis Daniel Haynes and Sherry Y. Samuels for
SUPERVISORY WRIT in No. 83,828 on the docket of the Forty Second Judicial
District, Parish of DESOTO, Judge Nicholas E. Gasper.

SCOTT CRICHTON LAW, LLC

Scott J. Crichton

-and-

RICE & KENDIG, LLC

William Fabian Kendig, Jr.

-and-

GOUDARZI AND YOUNG

Brent Goudarzi

Jessica Allen

-and-

Rhys E. Burgess

Ethan Arbuckle

Counsel for:

Louis Daniel Haynes and Sherry Y.
Samuels

TAYLOR, WELLONS, POLITZ & DUHE
Lacey Sanchez Rispone
Michael Mann Thompson
David Scott Rainwater

Counsel for:
Omni Energy Transportation Corp.,
Omni Energy Services Corp., Charles
Holston, Inc., Daniel Parks, Starr
Indemnity & Liability Company,
Jackie Owens, Owens Trucking, LLC,
Progressive Insurance Company,
Brandon Wade, Aggregate Transport
Service, LLC, and Houston Specialty
Insurance Company

BEFORE STONE, MARCOTTE, and ELLENDER, JJ.

WRIT GRANTED; REVERSED; REMANDED.

The applicants, Louis Daniel Haynes and Sherry Y. Samuels, seek supervisory review of the trial court’s rulings excluding and placing restrictions on the use of deposition testimony. While this Court agrees that Attorney Brent Goudarzi’s conduct during the depositions in question was unprofessional, we find that the trial court abused its discretion and that the ruling is overbroad and premature. Accordingly, this writ is granted and the trial court’s ruling prohibiting the use of deposition testimony to impeach witnesses or for any other purpose is reversed. Whether portions of the deposition testimony should be admissible for any reason can better be determined at trial as it becomes necessary. This will allow the trial court to fashion an appropriate remedy by allowing relevant evidence to be presented while also presenting such evidence in context based on the circumstances presented at trial. This matter is remanded to the trial court for further proceedings.

Shreveport, Louisiana, this 25 day of February, 2026.

DJE SDS COM

FILED: February 25, 2026

Molly Melton

DEPUTY CLERK