

**Fifth Circuit Court of Appeal
State of Louisiana**

No. 26-K-40

STATE OF LOUISIANA

versus

SHONDRELL LA'SHON PERRILLOUX

IN RE SHONDRELL LA'SHON PERRILLOUX
APPLYING FOR SUPERVISORY WRIT FROM THE FORTIETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT,
PARISH OF ST JOHN THE BAPTIST, STATE OF LOUISIANA, DIRECTED TO THE HONORABLE
NGHANA LEWIS, DIVISION "B", NUMBER 25-CR-171

TRUE COPY

April 15, 2026



LINDA TRAN
DEPUTY CLERK

Panel composed of Judges Fredericka Homberg Wicker,
Jude G. Gravois, and John J. Molaison, Jr.

WRIT DENIED

In this *pro se* writ application, Relator-Defendant Shondrell La'Shon Perrilloux seeks supervisory review of the trial court's January 20, 2026 order denying her fifth *pro se* motion to quash. For the reasons discussed below, we deny the writ application.

BACKGROUND

On April 29, 2025, the State charged Relator by bill of information with issuing worthless checks valued in excess of \$1,500. On September 15, 2025, Relator filed her fifth *pro se* motion to quash. In that motion, Relator asserted that the trial court lacked jurisdiction pursuant to La. C.Cr.P. art. 532(8), which provides:

“The court has no jurisdiction of the offense charged.”¹ Relator argued that the 40th Judicial District Court lacked jurisdiction because the check at issue—signed by Relator, a resident of St. John the Baptist Parish—was received and deposited by the victim in Jefferson Parish. Relator maintained that Jefferson Parish was the proper venue under La. C.Cr.P. art. 611, which requires that “[a]ll trials take place in the parish where the offense has been committed.”

On September 17, 2025, the trial court set the motion for hearing on October 21, 2025, later resetting the matter for January 20, 2026. At the January 20, 2026 hearing, the State presented testimony from Marco Demma, Vice President of Fraud Investigations for Regions Bank, who described his investigation of the returned check. Mr. Demma testified that Relator opened her account at a Regions Bank branch located in St. John the Baptist Parish. He further testified that the check, endorsed by Relator and returned for insufficient funds, was deposited at a Regions Bank branch in Jefferson Parish. Relator also testified at the hearing. She stated that she wrote the check in Jefferson Parish, where it was received and deposited. She explained that she opened her business account at the Regions Bank in St. John the Baptist Parish because she is domiciled there.

After hearing argument from both sides, the trial court denied the motion, ruling:

[G]iven the fact that the testimony establishes a connectivity specifically to the St. John the Baptist Parish branch, venue is properly established, and jurisdiction is properly established by the state in St. John the Baptist Parish. It could also be established in Jefferson Parish, based upon what the case law indicates. And I took time, as I do with all cases, but especially in this case because this was the fifth Motion to Quash that Ms. Perrilloux had filed *pro se* on the very issue that I previously addressed in the first, second, third and fourth Motion to Quash where I denied the Motion to Quash. Jurisdiction and venue are proper in St. John the Baptist Parish.

¹ Relator also cited La. C.Cr.P. art. 532(1), which states: “The indictment fails to charge an offense which is punishable under a valid statute.” However, she did not appear to provide any specific argument on this ground in her motion or at the January 20, 2026 hearing.

Furthermore, in its order issued the same day, the trial court stated: “None of the grounds for quashing the Bill of Information lies, as the bill clearly sets forth the offense for which Ms. Perrilloux is charged and the manner in which Ms. Perrilloux allegedly violated La. R.S. 14:71(C).”

On January 22, 2026, Relator filed a notice of intent and, that same day, the trial court set a return date of February 23, 2026. Relator filed the instant writ application on February 3, 2026.

LAW AND ANALYSIS

The following background is taken from our prior review in this matter:

Relator is the manager of A Quality Touch Commercial Builders, LLC, which has a business mailing address in St. Charles Parish. She is domiciled in St John Parish. On or around August 15, 2024, Relator received \$5,000 in cash from Mr. Joseph Banks for building materials in exchange for a check for \$7,300, post-dated September 17, 2024. The check is written against the account of A Quality Touch Commercial Builders LLC to “Joseph Bank”; the check is signed by Relator. Relator alleges that she issued the check to Mr. Banks at the RaceTrac in Kenner at the intersection of Airline and Williams Blvd, which is in Jefferson Parish. Relator avers that she was in constant contact with Mr. Banks and he was aware that she was awaiting payment from a third party, in order to have the funds needed to clear the check.

Relator alleges that notice of non-payment was sent by the Office of the District Attorney for the Parish of St. John the Baptist on December 10, 2024 by regular mail. On December 19, 2024, Relator filed a letter to advise the District Attorney that she intended to settle her debts with Mr. Banks in January and asked to be relieved of the letter of demand. A warrant for her arrest was issued on February 1, 2025 – she turned herself in a few weeks later. On April 9, 2025, a bill of information was filed against Relator, charging her with issuing worthless checks worth \$1500 or more, in violation of La. R.S. 14:71(C). Both the warrant and the bill of information state that the offense was committed in St. John the Baptist Parish.

St. John Baptist Par. Dist. Att’y v. Perrilloux, 25-367, 2025 WL 2607762, at *1–2 (La. App. 5 Cir. 9/9/25).

As discussed above, Relator previously sought review of the trial court’s denial of her third motion to quash, challenged jurisdiction and venue, the classification of the matter as a criminal offense, and the State’s evidence. Relator

argued that St. John the Baptist Parish lacked jurisdiction due to improper venue. This Court did not reach the merits of that claim, explaining that, “although a claim of improper venue is properly raised in advance of trial via a motion to quash under La. C.Cr.P. art. 615, we cannot tell from the contents of the application whether Relator first raised the issue at the district court.” *Id.* at *2. Although this Court did not consider her jurisdiction and venue challenge, it found that “the State’s allegations against Relator comprise the elements of a violation of La. R.S. 14:71 Issuing worthless checks.” *Id.* This Court further held that Relator’s remaining arguments went to the merits and were “not properly raised by a motion to quash,” but must be resolved at trial. *Id.* Now, in her fifth motion to quash, Relator again contends that St. John the Baptist Parish lacks jurisdiction due to improper venue. She argues that the trial court erred in denying her motion because both the alleged transaction and deposit occurred in Jefferson Parish, and that the only connection to St. John the Baptist Parish was her company’s checking account, which she opened more than twenty years earlier at a Regions Bank branch in LaPlace.

Generally, the trial judge’s denial of a motion to quash should not be reversed in the absence of a clear abuse of the trial court’s discretion. *State v. Odeh*, 21-657 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/23/21), 335 So.3d 977, 986, *writ denied*, 22-148 (La. 3/15/22), 334 So.3d 396. A motion to quash raises all pretrial pleas or defenses, except those relating to mental capacity to proceed or pleas of “not guilty” and “not guilty and not guilty by reason of insanity.” La. C.Cr.P. art. 531. The general grounds for a motion to quash are set forth in La. C.Cr.P. art. 532. Under La. C.Cr.P. art. 532(8), a motion to quash may be granted when the court lacks jurisdiction over the offense charged. Article I, § 16 of the Louisiana Constitution guarantees a person charged with a crime a trial in the parish where the offense or an element of the offense occurred, unless venue is changed in accordance with law. Similarly, La. C.Cr.P. art. 611(A) provides:

All trials shall take place in the parish where the offense has been committed, unless the venue is changed. If acts constituting an offense or if the elements of an offense occurred in more than one place, in or out of the parish or state, the offense is deemed to have been committed in any parish in this state in which any such act or element occurred.

Furthermore, La. C.Cr.P. art. 615 provides:

Improper venue shall be raised in advance of trial by motion to quash, and shall be tried by the judge alone. Venue shall not be considered an essential element to be proven by the state at trial, rather it shall be a jurisdictional matter to be proven by the state by a preponderance of the evidence and decided by the court in advance of trial.

Here, the bill of information charges Relator with issuing a worthless check in violation of La. R.S. 14:71, which provides, in pertinent part:

Issuing worthless checks is the issuing, in exchange for anything of value, whether the exchange is contemporaneous or not, with intent to defraud, of any check, draft, or order for the payment of money upon any bank or other depository, knowing at the time of the issuing that the offender has not sufficient credit with the bank, or other depository for the payment of such check, draft, or order in full upon its presentation.

La. R.S. 14:71(A)(1)(a). Subsection (A)(1)(f) of La. R.S. 14:71 provides that “any check, draft, or order tendered for payment of any tax, fee, fine, penalty or other obligation to the state or any of its political subdivisions shall be considered issuing a check, draft, or order in exchange for anything of value.” Thus, the elements of the charged offense are as follows: (1) issuance by defendant, in exchange for anything of value, whether the exchange is contemporaneous or not; (2) of a check, draft or order for the payment of money upon any bank or other depository; (3) knowing at the time of the issuing that the account on which drawn has insufficient funds with the financial institution on which the check is drawn to have the instrument paid in full on presentation; and (4) the instrument was issued with intent to defraud. La. R.S. 14:71; *State v. Collins*, 11-485 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/13/11), 81 So.3d 135, 138–39; *State v. Mosby*, 42,519 (La. App. 2 Cir. 5/18/07), 956 So.2d 843, 845. The gravamen of the offense is “the giving or delivering of a worthless check, draft or order in exchange for something of value with the intent to defraud.”

State v. Bellavia, 91-1488 (La. App. 4 Cir. 5/28/92), 599 So.2d 915, 916, *writ denied*, 92-1886 (La. 1992), 604 So.2d 1317.

In support of her claim, Relator relies on *State v. Jones*, No. 11-140, 2011 WL 9160398, at *1 (La. App. 4 Cir. 11/9/11), in which the Fourth Circuit applied the *Bellavia* standard and concluded that “the act(s) or conduct constituting issuing worthless checks is the delivery (issuing) of the check.” 2011 WL 9160398, at *3. In *Jones*, the Fourth Circuit held that venue was proper in St. Tammany Parish, where the defendant delivered the check—a fact conceded by the State—and rejected the State’s argument that venue was in Orleans Parish merely because work was performed there in exchange for the check. *Id.* Applying the *Bellavia* standard, Relator relies on her testimony from the hearing that she both signed and delivered the check in Jefferson Parish. Mr. Demma likewise testified that the check was deposited at a Regions Bank in Jefferson Parish. Relator therefore argues that venue is improper in St. John the Baptist Parish because both the delivery and deposit of the check occurred in Jefferson Parish.

However, Louisiana law does not confer venue based on every act related to an offense, but only an “act constituting an offense” or an “element of an offense.” La. C.Cr.P. art. 611; *State v. Gross*, 18-1014 (La. App. 1 Cir. 2/25/19), 273 So.3d 317, 321, *writ denied*, 19-498 (La. 9/17/19), 278 So.3d 972. Former La. R.S. 15:13 permitted venue where a “substantial element” of the offense occurred; however, by adopting the “act or element” test in La. C.Cr.P. art. 611, the Legislature rejected that standard. *Gross*, 273 So.3d at 321. The *locus delicti* of a crime “must be determined from the nature of the crime alleged and the location of the act or acts constituting it.” *State v. Hayes*, 01-3193 (La. 1/28/03), 837 So.2d 1195, 1197 (quoting *United States v. Cabrales*, 524 U.S. 1, 6-7, 118 S.Ct. 1772, 1776, 141 L.Ed.2d 1 (1998)).

In denying the motion to quash, the trial court acknowledged that, under existing jurisprudence, jurisdiction and venue could also lie in Jefferson Parish. The trial court nevertheless reasoned that the relevant inquiry was not merely where the check was delivered, but whether sufficient funds were available in the account when the check was presented to the bank. The trial court explained that the material consideration was whether the check was supported by sufficient funds “when the check hit the bank.” In reaching this conclusion, the trial court relied on *State v. Collins*, 11-485 (La. App. 5 Cir. 12/13/11), 81 So.3d 135, in which this Court reversed a conviction for issuing a worthless check because the State failed to prove that the defendant knew, at the time of issuance, that the account lacked sufficient funds. *Id.* at 140. In *Collins*, the evidence showed that sufficient funds existed at issuance and for several weeks thereafter, and that the defendant withdrew the funds only after a later contractual dispute arose. Accordingly, the knowledge element of La. R.S. 14:71 was not proven. *Id.*

In the instant case, the trial court found that the State properly established jurisdiction and venue in St. John the Baptist Parish, concluding that “the testimony establishes a connectivity specifically to the St. John the Baptist Parish branch[.]” As discussed in *Collins*, the insufficient funds element of La. R.S. 14:71 requires knowledge that the account lacks sufficient credit with the bank. At the hearing, Mr. Demma testified that the returned check was drawn on Relator’s account, which was opened in St. John the Baptist Parish. Relator also admitted that she opened her Regions Bank business account at the St. John the Baptist Parish branch and has maintained that account for twenty years because she is domiciled there. In light of the testimony establishing that Relator’s account was maintained in St. John the Baptist Parish and lacked sufficient funds to cover the check, we find no abuse of discretion in the trial court’s denial of Relator’s motion to quash.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, this writ application is denied.

Gretna, Louisiana, this 15th day of April, 2026.

FHW
JGG
JJM

SUSAN M. CHEHARDY
CHIEF JUDGE

FREDERICKA H. WICKER
JUDE G. GRAVOIS
MARC E. JOHNSON
STEPHEN J. WINDHORST
JOHN J. MOLAISSON, JR.
SCOTT U. SCHLEGEL
TIMOTHY S. MARCEL

JUDGES



FIFTH CIRCUIT
101 DERBIGNY STREET (70053)
POST OFFICE BOX 489
GRETNA, LOUISIANA 70054
www.fifthcircuit.org

CURTIS B. PURSELL
CLERK OF COURT

SUSAN S. BUCHHOLZ
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

LINDA M. TRAN
FIRST DEPUTY CLERK

MELISSA C. LEDET
DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL STAFF

(504) 376-1400
(504) 376-1498 FAX

NOTICE OF DISPOSITION CERTIFICATE OF DELIVERY

I CERTIFY THAT A COPY OF THE DISPOSITION IN THE FOREGOING MATTER HAS BEEN TRANSMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH **UNIFORM RULES - COURT OF APPEAL, RULE 4-6** THIS DAY **04/15/2026** TO THE TRIAL JUDGE, THE TRIAL COURT CLERK OF COURT, AND AT LEAST ONE OF THE COUNSEL OF RECORD FOR EACH PARTY, AND TO EACH PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL, AS LISTED BELOW:

CURTIS B. PURSELL
CLERK OF COURT

26-K-40

E-NOTIFIED

40th District Court (Clerk)
Honorable Nghana Lewis (DISTRICT JUDGE)
Bridget A. Dinvaut (Respondent)

MAILED

Shondrell La'Shon Perrilloux (Relator)
In Proper Person
1118 Main Street
Laplace, LA 70068