



exceptions of no cause of action.” *Scott v. Zaheri*, 14-0726, p. 3 (La. App. 4 Cir. 12/3/14), 157 So.3d 779, 782-83 (citing *Everything on Wheels Subaru, Inc. v. Subaru S., Inc.*, 616 So.2d 1234, 1239 (La. 1993)). “The reason for this disfavor is that granting a partial exception of no cause of action fosters multiple appeals, ‘which forces an appellate court to consider the merits of the action in a piecemeal fashion.’” *Parker v. Paladin Contractors, LLC*, 20-0492, p. 7 (La. App. 4 Cir. 3/3/21), 314 So.3d 1128, 1134 (quoting *Zaheri*, 14-0726, p. 17, 157 So.3d at 789). Where “the petition asserts several demands or theories of recovery based on a single cause of action arising out of one transaction or occurrence, ... the court should overrule the exception of no cause of action when the petition states a cause of action as to any demand or theory of recovery.” *Parker*, 20-0492, p. 8, 314 So.3d at 1135 (quoting *Subaru*, 616 So.2d at 1242). Such is the case here, and overruling the exception is the proper remedy.

Moreover, the petition alone does not ascertain whether the City of New Orleans or any tax purchaser has brought any litigation to quiet title. It is prudent to deny the writ at this stage to avoid piecemeal litigation and clarify the claims with evidence introduced at the summary judgment stage or at trial.