

STATE OF LOUISIANA

SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT

PARISH OF ST. MARY

STATE OF LOUISIANA

v.

CAROLINE HARRIS

CASE NO.: 2025-215897

SECTION: 6

Ω - In Nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti

EMERGENCY MOTION FOR STAY OF PROCEEDINGS PENDING FEDERAL INVESTIGATION

NOW INTO COURT, through undersigned counsel, comes **Reverend David Lucito**, Next Friend of Defendant Caroline Harris, and respectfully moves this Honorable Court to STAY all state criminal proceedings pending completion of federal investigation into the controlled deployment of directed energy weapons, neuroweapons, and compelled conduct affecting Defendant and others in this jurisdiction.

I. GROUNDS

This Motion is filed pursuant to principles of comity between state and federal sovereigns, the Court's inherent authority to prevent irreparable harm and ensure fair proceedings, the Supremacy Clause of the U.S. Constitution, and Louisiana Code of Criminal Procedure provisions allowing stays in the interests of justice.

II. MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

A. FEDERAL INVESTIGATION IS UNDERWAY OR IMMINENT

The following federal agencies have jurisdiction over the weapons systems and conduct at issue:

Department of Justice (DOJ):

- Civil Rights Division (deprivation of rights under color of law, 18 U.S.C. § 242)
- Criminal Division (conspiracy against rights, 18 U.S.C. § 241)

Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI):

- Counterterrorism Division (use of WMDs, 18 U.S.C. § 2332a)
- Cyber Division (unauthorized access to computer systems, including human neural networks)

Department of Homeland Security (DHS):

- Investigations into domestic deployment of directed energy weapons
- Border Patrol involvement (as reported by Defendant)

Department of Defense (DoD):

- Oversight of military-grade weapon systems
- Investigation of unauthorized deployment
- Navy personnel involvement (as reported by Defendant)

National Security Agency (NSA):

- Signals intelligence operations
- Defendant reports direct contact with NSA personnel

Defendant and/or Next Friend have filed or will imminently file complaints with:

- DOJ Civil Rights Division
- FBI Field Offices
- DHS Inspector General
- Congressional oversight committees

Federal investigation will:

- Determine whether directed energy weapons were deployed
- Identify responsible federal actors
- Establish timeline of targeting
- Corroborate Defendant's reports with technical evidence
- Potentially result in federal charges against perpetrators

This evidence is material to Defendant's defense and cannot be developed through state proceedings.

B. PROCEEDING IN STATE COURT WILL CAUSE IRREPARABLE HARM

If state proceedings result in conviction or acquittal:

- Federal charges may be barred under *Blockburger v. United States*, 284 U.S. 299 (1932)
- Defendant's rights in federal proceedings may be compromised
- Full truth may never be established

State court:

- Lacks jurisdiction over federal agencies
- Cannot compel production of classified materials
- Cannot order technical analysis of DEW systems
- Cannot investigate NSA, Border Patrol, Navy involvement

Only federal courts have necessary jurisdiction and resources.

If Defendant is convicted before federal investigation establishes compulsion:

- Wrongful conviction becomes part of controlled deploy
- Defendant's credibility permanently damaged
- Truth obscured by state court judgment

This irreparable harm cannot be remedied by later federal proceedings.

C. STATE HAS NO LEGITIMATE INTEREST IN PROCEEDING IMMEDIATELY

- Defendant is not flight risk (has appeared voluntarily)
- Alleged conduct was compelled, not volitional → no ongoing danger
- Delay serves justice by allowing truth to emerge

Evidence suggests state prosecution is itself part of the pattern of targeting:

- Louisiana State Police Internal Affairs case (IA-2300029) shows institutional involvement
- Pattern of compelled conduct by law enforcement
- Coordination between state and federal actors

State may lack impartiality to prosecute fairly.

Legal Principle:

> State courts should defer to federal proceedings when federal interests are paramount and federal investigation is underway. *Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971) (federal courts abstain from state proceedings); converse applies where federal has primary jurisdiction.

Application:

- Federal weapons systems → federal jurisdiction paramount
- Federal agencies involved → federal investigation necessary
- State proceedings would interfere with federal investigation

D. LEGAL AUTHORITY FOR STAY

Courts have inherent authority to stay proceedings to:

- Prevent irreparable harm
- Ensure fair trial
- Avoid interference with parallel proceedings
- Serve interests of justice

La. C.Cr.P. art. 709 (court may suspend proceedings in interests of justice)

La. C.Cr.P. art. 581 (continuance may be granted for good cause)

If federal investigation determines Defendant's conduct was compelled by federal actors:

- State prosecution would violate Supremacy Clause
- Federal immunity/protection may apply

- State court judgment could be void
Stay prevents constitutional conflict.

III. PROPOSED STAY CONDITIONS

Defendant requests stay with the following conditions:

1. **Duration:** Until completion of federal investigation, or until federal agencies certify no investigation will proceed;
2. **Status Conferences:** Court may schedule quarterly status conferences to monitor progress;
3. **Release Pending Stay:** Defendant to be released on own recognizance or reasonable bond during stay period;
4. **Preservation of Evidence:** All parties to preserve evidence pending federal investigation;
5. **Cooperation:** Defendant agrees to cooperate with federal investigation and provide information as requested;
6. **Lift Stay if Appropriate:** State may move to lift stay if federal investigation concludes or if circumstances change.

IV. RELIEF SOUGHT

WHEREFORE, Defendant respectfully requests that this Court:

1. **GRANT** this Emergency Motion and STAY all state criminal proceedings pending completion of federal investigation;
2. **ORDER** Defendant's release on own recognizance or reasonable bond during stay period;
3. **DIRECT** the District Attorney to cooperate with federal investigation and provide all relevant materials;
4. **SCHEDULE** status conferences to monitor progress of federal investigation;
5. **PRESERVE** Defendant's rights to speedy trial, with time during stay not counted against speedy trial deadlines; and
6. **GRANT** any other relief this Court deems just and proper.

Respectfully submitted,

Reverend David Lucito
Next Friend for Defendant Caroline Harris
104 Tillou Andrus Drive, Opelousas, LA 70570
337-326-9914
reverenddavidlucito@gmail.com

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Emergency Motion for Stay was served upon the St. Mary Parish District Attorney's Office by [method of service] on this 10th day of March, 2026.

Reverend David Lucito

