

<b>DOMINION CREDIT, LLC</b>	*	<b>NO. 2012-CA-1420</b>
<b>VERSUS</b>	*	<b>COURT OF APPEAL</b>
<b>SAMUEL BAILEY, JR., D/B/A LOUJISIANA DEMOLITION AND SAMUEL BAILEY, JR.</b>	*	<b>FOURTH CIRCUIT</b>
	*	<b>STATE OF LOUISIANA</b>
	*	
	*	
	*	

\* \* \* \* \*

**BONIN, J., CONCURS WITH REASONS.**

I concur in the action taken on rehearing but write separately to note that neither we nor the trial court have taken *any* action on Mr. Bailey’s reconventional demand. Because the reconventional demand has not yet been litigated or placed before us, our silence in the original opinion and in the opinion on rehearing should not be understood to have disposed of the reconventional demand. *Cf., e.g., Guillot v. Daimlerchrysler Corp.*, 12-0888, p. 4 (La. App. 4 Cir. 4/15/13), --- So. 3d ---, ---, 2013 WL 1624887 (“[s]ilence in a judgment on any issue that has been placed before the court is deemed a rejection of that claim”) and the cases cited therein. Further, in that regard and with reference to our denial of Mr. Bailey’s application for supervisory review in proceedings # 2012-0239, I note that our language there respecting the correctness of the issuance of the writ of sequestration is “without effect.” *See Davis v. Jazz Casino Co.*, 03-0276, p. 1 (La. 6/6/03), 849 So. 2d 497, 498, *citing to Bulot v. Intracoastal Tubular Services, Inc.*, 02-1035 (La. 6/14/02), 817 So. 2d 1149.