NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

STATE OF LOUISIANA

COURT OF APPEAL

FIRST CIRCUIT

2026 CA 0101

RICHMOND BOYD, JR.

VERSUS

KENNETH P. JOHNSON

CONSOLIDATED WITH

2026 CA 0102

KAINA J. BOYD

VERSUS

KENNETH P. JOHNSON

SEP 18 2026

Judgment Rendered:

* * * * * * * *

Appealed from the 17th Judicial District Court
In and for the Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana
Case No. 134656 c/w 134657

The Honorable John E. Conery, Ad Hoc Judge

* * * * * * * *

Kenneth P. Johnson **Raceland, Louisiana**	**Appellant** ***Pro Se***
Kathleen M. Wilson **Baton Rouge, Louisiana**	**Counsel for Defendant/Appellant** **Kenneth P. Johnson**
Catherine Masterson **Patrick M. Amedee** **Joseph Z. Landry** **Thibodaux, Louisiana**	**Counsel for Plaintiffs/Appellees** **Richmond Boyd, Jr. and** **Kaina Boyd**

* * * * * * * *

BEFORE: THERIOT, GREENE, AND EDWARDS, JJ.

THERIOT, J.

The defendant appeals from a trial court judgment denying his motion to dissolve a protective order, granting the plaintiff's rule for contempt, and awarding sanctions. For the reasons set forth herein, we affirm.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY[1]

On January 29, 2018, Richmond Boyd, Jr. ("Richmond") and his wife, Kaina J. Boyd ("Kaina"), filed separate petitions for temporary restraining orders ("TROs") and preliminary and permanent injunctions against Kenneth P. Johnson ("Johnson"). Both Richmond's petition (trial court docket number 134656) and Kaina's petition (trial court docket number 134657) alleged conduct amounting to stalking and harassment by Johnson. Following a February 6, 2018 contradictory hearing, the trial court granted the Boyds' requests for permanent protective orders against Johnson. The protective orders were signed by the trial court and by all of the parties in court immediately following the hearing, and the trial court provided each party with a copy of the signed protective orders at that time, stating:

> My clerk is going to process it and give everyone copies. You're going to have to come forward and sign each of the copies so a deputy doesn't have to serve you. . . . That just eliminates the need for the deputy to have to go and serve y'all after we file it. You're going to get your service copy here in court.

On March 1, 2018, Johnson filed a notice of intent to seek supervisory review of the February 6, 2018 judgment granting the protective order in docket number 134656 (Richmond). The trial court set a return date of March 23, 2018; however, Johnson never filed a writ application.

Thereafter, on April 3, 2018, Johnson filed a motion to amend judgment pursuant to La. C.C.P. art. 1951 and for new trial in docket number 134657

---

[1] The full factual and procedural history of this protracted litigation was set forth by this Court in a prior appellate opinion, *Boyd v. Johnson*, 2025-0989, 2025-0990 (La.App. 1 Cir. 5/28/26), --- So.3d ---.

(Kaina),[2] arguing that newly discovered evidence demonstrated that he did not harass Richmond at his church and asserting that the trial court erred in making the February 6, 2018 protective orders permanent. The trial court denied Johnson's motion on April 18, 2018. In written reasons for judgment, the trial court explained that Johnson's motion to amend sought to alter the substance of the judgment, which is improper under La. C.C.P. art. 1951. The trial court further explained that Johnson's motion for new trial was untimely, noting that Johnson was served with the February 6, 2018 protective order in open court on the date of the hearing, and the delay for filing a motion for new trial had expired. Johnson did not seek review of the April 18, 2018 judgment.

Almost two years later, on February 2, 2021, Johnson filed a motion to dissolve the protective order in docket number 134656 (Richmond), stating that he felt that he was being harassed by the Boyds because they call law enforcement whenever they see him. On February 5, 2021, at a hearing on a rule for contempt filed by the Boyds, the trial court dismissed Johnson's motion to dissolve.

On February 17, 2021, Johnson filed a motion to annul or dissolve the permanent protective order in docket number 134656 (Richmond).[3] In this motion, Johnson argued that the appeal delays never commenced as to the February 6, 2018 protective order because notice of judgment was never mailed by the clerk of court. The trial court denied Johnson's motion on February 18, 2021, explaining that it was interpreting it as a motion for new trial or motion for appeal, both of which were untimely because the delays for filing such motions commenced upon

[2] Although Johnson only filed this pleading in docket number 134657 (Kaina), he referred only to Richmond in the caption and only requested relief from the protective order in favor of Richmond.

[3] Although this motion was apparently filed only in docket number 134656 (Richmond), Johnson referred to the matters as if they had been consolidated (they had not) and sought to annul or dissolve the protective orders issued in both cases.

the service of the permanent protective order in open court by the deputy sheriff/bailiff on February 6, 2018.[4]

On February 22, 2021, Johnson filed a motion to appeal the February 6, 2018 permanent protective order, as well as the February 5, 2021 denial of his motion to dissolve the protective order and the February 18, 2021 judgment denying his motion to annul or dissolve the protective order in docket number 134656 (Richmond).[5] The trial court denied the motion on that same date, explaining again that the appeal delays for the February 6, 2018 protective order had expired, but the February 18, 2021 judgment was reviewable by supervisory writ application. Johnson did not file an application for supervisory review of the February 18, 2021 judgment.

On March 2, 2021, Johnson filed a petition for writ of mandamus in docket number 134656 (Richmond),[6] asking the trial court to order the Lafourche Parish Clerk of Court to show cause why the suit record does not contain a notice of mailing of judgment for the February 6, 2018 permanent protective order. Following a hearing on the matter, the trial court denied Johnson's request. Johnson filed a motion for new trial or for reconsideration, which was denied, and thereafter appealed the May 4, 2021 judgment denying his request for mandamus. However, Johnson's appeal was dismissed for abandonment pursuant to Uniform Rules – Courts of Appeal, Rules 2-8.6 and 2-12.7 on December 15, 2021.

---

[4] During the February 6, 2018 contradictory hearing, the trial court clearly explained to the parties that they were going to sign and then receive their "service copy" of the protective orders in court in order to "eliminate[] the need for the deputy to have to go and serve y'all after we file it."

[5] Although the motion was filed only in docket number 134656 (Richmond), Johnson again listed both suits in the caption, stating that the matters were consolidated, although they were not.

[6] The trial court noted at the hearing on the writ of mandamus that the writ was filed in both docket numbers. However, the appellate record in docket number 134657 (Kaina) does not contain a copy of the writ. Although the suits were not consolidated at that time, the trial court considered the mandamus request in both cases and ruled on both at the hearing.

On March 16, 2023, Johnson filed motions to dissolve the February 6, 2018 protective orders in both docket numbers, alleging that he did not pose a threat to the Boyds. The Boyds opposed the motions, noting that Johnson has continued to stalk and harass them, both in-person and online, over the five years since the protective orders were issued. The Boyds also argued that the motions should be dismissed pursuant to the doctrine of res judicata, since Johnson had previously filed several other motions to dissolve the February 6, 2018 protective orders, all of which were denied by the trial court. The Boyds also requested an award of court costs and reasonable attorney fees for their defense of Johnson's repetitive filings.

On September 21, 2023, the Boyds filed rules for contempt of court and for sanctions in both docket numbers, alleging that Johnson has continued to violate the protective orders by stalking and harassing them and that his repetitive, frivolous filings have caused them to incur significant legal fees and costs.

A hearing was held on Johnson's motions to dissolve the protective orders, as well as on the Boyds' rules for contempt and sanctions.[7] At the conclusion of the hearing, the trial court denied Johnson's motions to dissolve the protective orders and granted the Boyds' rules for contempt. Two separate, but identical written judgments (one in each docket number) were signed by the trial court on October 27, 2023, denying the motions to dissolve the protective orders, granting the rules for contempt, sentencing Johnson to serve thirty days in jail for the violation of the protective order (suspended pending service of a one-year unsupervised probation period), and ordering Johnson to pay court costs and

[7] The minute entry for the October 24, 2023 hearing reflects that a full contradictory hearing was held and the trial court heard testimony from the parties and received evidence; however, the record before us on appeal contains only a transcript of the trial court's ruling on that date. The burden of furnishing the appellate court with a record of the proceedings below is on the appellant, and when the appellate record lacks a transcript that is pertinent to an issue raised on appeal, the inadequacy of the record is attributable to the appellant. *Gardner v. Latin*, 2025-1333, p. 6 n.5 (La.App. 1 Cir. 6/18/26), --- So.3d ---, --- n.5.

$1,500.00 in attorney fees. Johnson appealed separately from each October 27, 2023 judgment.[8]

In his appeal from the October 27, 2023 judgment rendered in docket number 134656 (Richmond), Johnson raised six assignments of error. This Court affirmed, pointing out that none of Johnson's six assignments of error pertained to the October 27, 2023 judgment before this Court on appeal. As this Court explained, all of Johnson's assignments of error concerned either the February 6, 2018 protective order or the May 4, 2021 judgment denying his petition for mandamus, and although Johnson argued in his appellate brief that those judgments were properly before this Court, we determined that they were not. As Johnson did not raise any assignments of error pertaining to the October 27, 2023 judgment, there were no issues for this Court to review in the appeal. See *Boyd v. Johnson*, 2025-0989, 2025-0990, pp. 8-12 (La.App. 1 Cir. 5/28/26), --- So.3d ---, ---.

In the instant matter, Johnson appealed from the October 27, 2023 trial court judgment in docket number 134657 (Kaina), which, as we have previously noted, is identical to the October 27, 2023 judgment in docket number 134656 (Richmond) affirmed by this Court in the prior appeal, with the exception of the caption. After receiving a notice of abandonment from this Court for his failure to file an appellate brief in this matter within the time allowed, Johnson filed a pro se appellate brief that contained no assignments of error or argument. Johnson then filed a supplemental brief prepared by counsel, which was identical to the counseled brief filed in his prior appeal in docket number 134656 (Richmond).[9]

---

[8] Following the issuance of the October 27, 2023 judgments, but prior to the lodging of Johnson's appeals, the matters were consolidated in the trial court.

[9] Attached to Johnson's supplemental brief was a copy of the October 27, 2023 trial court judgment in docket number 134656 (Richmond) (the judgment affirmed in the prior appeal), rather than the October 27, 2023 judgment in docket number 134657 (Kaina) that is before this Court in this appeal.

As in the prior appeal, we note that none of Johnson's six counseled assignments of error pertain to the October 27, 2023 judgment that is before this Court on appeal. Five of Johnson's assignments of error relate entirely to the February 6, 2018 protective orders, and the sixth pertains to the May 4, 2021 judgment denying his petition for writ of mandamus. For the reasons set forth in detail in this Court's opinion affirming the identical judgment in *Boyd v. Johnson*, 2025-0989, 2025-0990, pp. 8-12 (La.App. 1 Cir. 5/28/26), --- So.3d ---, ---, we affirm the October 27, 2023 judgment rendered in docket number 134657 (Kaina).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth herein and in *Boyd v. Johnson*, 2025-0989, 2025-0990 (La.App. 1 Cir. 5/28/26), --- So.3d ---, the October 27, 2023 judgment rendered in trial court docket number 134657 (Kaina) is affirmed. Costs of this appeal are assessed to appellant, Kenneth P. Johnson.

AFFIRMED.