Case: 13-30669 Document: 00513152884 Page: 1 Date Filed: 08/13/2015

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-30669

United States Court of Appeals Fifth Circuit

FILED

August 13, 2015

Lyle W. Cayce Clerk

R.T. FAULK, III, COREY FARMS, L.L.C.; FAULK FARMS, INCORPORATED; JOANNE HODGES; RIVER VALLEY PROPERTIES; MCHENRY FARMS, L.L.C.; SHERMAN SHAW; T. P. GODWIN; WILLIAM G. NADLER; MCHENRY REALTY PARTNERSHIP

Plaintiffs-Appellees

v.

UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY

Defendant-Appellant

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Louisiana USDC No. 3:07-CV-554

Before JOLLY, SOUTHWICK, and HAYNES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:*

This case concerns a dispute over the proposed closing of several private railroad crossings in Louisiana. The district court determined that the railroads have a servitude, rather than fee-simple ownership, over the land. It then certified to this court the question of whether a Louisiana statute preventing the railroads from closing the private crossings violates the

_

^{*} Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

No. 13-30669

Louisiana Constitution's prohibition on takings. We granted the interlocutory appeal, addressed certain issues, and certified the remaining dispositive issue to the Louisiana Supreme Court pursuant to Louisiana Supreme Court Rule XII § 1 and LA. REV. STAT. § 13:72.1. See Faulk v. Union Pac. R.R. Co., 576 F. App'x 345 (5th Cir. 2014). That court accepted the certified question and issued its answer on June 30, 2015. Faulk v. Union Pac. R.R. Co., 2015 La. LEXIS 1498 (La. June 30, 2015) (answering certified question); Faulk v. Union Pac. R.R. Co., 151 So. 3d 611 (La. 2014) (granting certification). We ordered supplemental briefing by the parties on the subject of whether any further issues remain to be resolved by this court at this point. They stated that there are not, and we agree.

Accordingly, the district court's March 22, 2013 partial summary judgment order certified for interlocutory appeal is AFFIRMED and the case is REMANDED for appropriate further proceedings.