

JUSTINE SCHLIE

v.

DANIEL C. INMAN

Submitted on Briefs July 1, 2014

Decided July 8, 2014

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Daniel C. Inman appeals from a protection from harassment order issued by the District Court (York, *Douglas, J.*) in favor of his former wife, Justine Schlie. Contrary to Inman’s contentions, the court did not abuse its discretion or exceed its statutory powers in directing him to refrain from sending correspondence to or calling Schlie’s residence. *See* 5 M.R.S. § 4655(1)(F) (2013) (stating that upon a finding that the defendant committed the alleged harassment, the court may “[e]nter[] any other orders determined necessary or appropriate in the discretion of the court”); *Jefts v. Dennis*, 2007 ME 129, ¶ 9, 931 A.2d 1055 (applying the abuse of discretion standard when evaluating the remedy chosen by the court in a protection from harassment action where there is a finding of harassment). Furthermore, the order does not violate Inman’s constitutional rights under the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Pitts v. Moore*, 2014 ME 59, ¶ 12, 90 A.3d 1169 (“[A] parent’s constitutional liberty interest in family integrity is not absolute, nor forever free from state interference.”).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

On the briefs:

Jonathan G. Mermin, Esq., Preti Flaherty Beliveau & Pachios, LLP,
Portland, for appellant Daniel Inman

Emily Green Esq., Caring Unlimited, Inc., Saco, for appellee Justine Schlie

York District Court docket number PA-2013-127
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY