The original instrument and the following digest, which constitutes no part of the legislative instrument, were prepared by Julie J. Baxter.

## DIGEST

Kostelka (SB 143)

<u>Present law</u> requires that an injunction be issued in cases where irreparable injury, loss, or damage may otherwise result to the applicant, or in other cases specifically provided by law.

<u>Present law</u> provides that no court shall have jurisdiction to issue any temporary restraining order, preliminary injunction, or permanent injunction against any state department, board, or agency to compel the expenditure of state funds when the director of such department, board, or agency or the governor certifies that the expenditure of such funds would have the effect of creating a deficit or be in violation of the requirements placed upon the expenditure of such funds by the legislature.

<u>Proposed law</u> retains <u>present law</u> relative to temporary restraining orders and provides that a petition for injunction shall be subject to the certification by affidavit being reviewed and approved by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget.

<u>Proposed law</u> provides that the affidavit shall be approved by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget at its next regularly scheduled meeting, but if that meeting is not within 15 days of filing the affidavit, the litigation subcommittee shall call a special meeting to approve the affidavit.

<u>Proposed law</u> provides that the court may, within five days of filing the petition for injunction, determine the petition to be frivolous or without merit, and deem the affidavit approved.

<u>Proposed law</u> provides that unless the court finds the petition frivolous or without merit, or unless the certification is approved by the Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget or the litigation subcommittee, the court shall set the hearing on the injunction pursuant to C.C.P. Art. 3602.

<u>Proposed law</u> provides that the state department, board, or agency shall have the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that the injunction sought would have the direct effect of creating a deficit within the agency or be in violation of the requirements placed upon the expenditure of the funds by the legislature.

<u>Proposed law</u> provides that an adverse party may traverse the facts alleged in the affidavits and may present evidence to controvert the affidavits.

<u>Present law</u> provides for duplicate provisions in Title 13 relative to temporary restraining orders and injunctions.

<u>Proposed law</u> repeals these duplicate provisions of <u>present law</u>.

Effective August 1, 2014.

(Amends C.C.P. Art. 3601(A); repeals R.S. 13:4062)