

IRENE EUGEN

v.

GEORGE SARNO

Submitted on Briefs July 30, 2014

Decided August 21, 2014

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and ALEXANDER, SILVER, MEAD, GORMAN, and JABAR, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Irene Eugen appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Biddeford, *Cantara, J.*) denying her request for a protection from abuse order against George Sarno on behalf of herself and her son. *See* 19-A M.R.S. §§ 4002(1), 4006 (2013). Contrary to Eugen’s contentions, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying her motion to continue the testimonial hearing, *see Wright & Mills v. Bispham*, 2002 ME 123, ¶ 13, 802 A.2d 430; *Bradshaw v. Bradshaw*, 2005 ME 14, ¶¶ 7-9, 866 A.2d 839; *Pelletier v. Pelletier*, 597 A.2d 60, 61 (Me. 1991), and did not err in determining that there was insufficient evidence to support a finding, by a preponderance of evidence, that Sarno had “abuse[d]” Eugen, *see* 19-A M.R.S. § 4006(1); *Preston v. Tracy*, 2008 ME 34, ¶¶ 10-11, 942 A.2d 718. Because we do not find Eugen’s remaining arguments to be persuasive, we do not address them separately.

By separate motion, Sarno requested attorney fees and costs for defending this appeal. *See* M.R. App. P. 13(f). Eugen had the opportunity to respond and did file her objection. After considering the merits of Eugen’s arguments on appeal, we conclude that sanctions are not warranted.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed. Motion for sanctions denied.

On the briefs:

Irene Eugen, pro se appellant

Amy T. Robidas, Esq., Robidas Law, LLC, Portland, for appellee
George Sarno

Biddeford District Court docket number PA-2012-395
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY