

**NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION**

**STATE OF LOUISIANA  
COURT OF APPEAL, THIRD CIRCUIT**

**CA 17-222**

**SIMPLE ENTERPRISES, INC., ET AL.**

**VERSUS**

**TEXAS PROPERTY, LLC, ET AL.**

\*\*\*\*\*

**APPEAL FROM THE  
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT  
PARISH OF LAFAYETTE, NO. C-20135599  
HONORABLE LAURIE A. HULIN, DISTRICT JUDGE**

\*\*\*\*\*

**JOHN E. CONERY  
JUDGE**

\*\*\*\*\*

Court composed of Elizabeth A. Pickett, John E. Conery, and Candyce G. Perret,  
Judges.

**APPEAL DISMISSED, WITHOUT PREJUDICE,  
CASE REMANDED TO THE TRIAL COURT.**

**Ike Huval  
Duhon Law Firm  
Post Office Box 52566  
Lafayette, Louisiana 70505  
(337) 237-9868  
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLEE:  
Texas Property, LLC**

**Eric Scott Neumann  
Attorney at Law  
Post Office Box 2220  
Lafayette, Louisiana 70502-2220  
(337) 237-1113  
COUNSEL FOR DEFENDANT/APPELLEE:  
Nedal Qamhiyeh**

**Dustin B. Gibson  
Attorney at Law  
1538 West Pinhook, Suite 103  
Lafayette, Louisiana 70503  
(337) 501-2418  
COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS/APPELLANTS:  
Simple Enterprises, Inc.  
Nolton J. Dalcourt, Jr.**

**CONERY, Judge.**

The Judgment at issue lacks proper decretal language. The appeal is dismissed without prejudice and this case is remanded to the trial court for preparation of a proper final judgment with appropriate decretal language in accordance with the law. *See Thomas v. Lafayette Parish Sch. Sys.*, 13-91 (La.App. 3 Cir. 3/6/13), 128 So.3d 1055.

However, we note that this court has stated that “[a] valid judgment must be precise, definite, and certain. A final appealable judgment must contain **decretal language**, and it must name the party in favor of whom the ruling is ordered, the party against whom the ruling is ordered, and the relief that is granted or denied.” *State v. White*, 05-718 (La.App. 3 Cir. 2/1/06), 921 So.2d 1144, 1146. Moreover, a judgment cannot require reference to extrinsic documents or pleading in order to discern the court’s ruling. *Vanderbrook v. Coachmen Industries, Inc.*, 2001-809 (La.App. 1 Cir. 5/10/02), 818 So.2d 906.

*Thomas*, 128 So.3d at 1056 (emphasis added); *See also Stutes v. Greenwood Motor Lines, Inc.*, 17-53, (La.App. 3 Cir. 3/8/17), 215 So.3d 287; *Holland v. Holland*, 16-117 (La.App. 3 Cir. 4/6/16), 188 So.3d 484; *Urquhart v. Spencer*, 15-1354, 15-1355 (La.App. 4 Cir. 12/1/16), 204 So.3d 1074; *Morraz–Blandon v. Voiron*, 16-122, (La.App. 5 Cir. 8/25/16), 199 So.3d 1220; and *Fortenberry v. Cont’l Cas. Co.*, 14-953, (La.App. 3 Cir. 10/15/14) (unpublished opinion).

In the interest of judicial economy, within thirty (30) days of this ruling, and **by stipulation of all counsel**, the record may remain lodged in this court and the final judgment on remand may be added to supplement this record, with the matter then being docketed for final disposition by this panel.

**APPEAL DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE, CASE REMANDED TO THE TRIAL COURT.**

**This opinion is NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION.** Uniform Rules—Courts of Appeal, Rule 2-13.3.