

HEATHER SKOLFIELD

v.

DANIEL MORRILL

Submitted on Briefs November 29, 2017
Decided March 6, 2018

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and ALEXANDER, MEAD, JABAR, HJELM, and HUMPHREY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Daniel Morrill appeals from a judgment entered by the District Court (Augusta, *E. Walker, J.*) extending a May 11, 2015, protective order against him directing him not to possess firearms and prohibiting him from initiating legal action and engaging in other legal process against Heather Skolfield. Protection from abuse relief is governed by 19-A M.R.S. §§ 4001-4014 (2017). Pursuant to 19-A M.R.S. § 4007(2) (2017), “[a] protective order or approved consent agreement is for a fixed period not to exceed 2 years.” However, “[a]t the expiration of that time, the court may extend an order, upon motion of the plaintiff, for such additional time as it determines necessary to protect the plaintiff . . . from abuse.” *Id.* Here, the court did not err in concluding that Skolfield met her burden by demonstrating that an extension of the 2015 order was necessary to protect her from abuse. *See id.* The court’s factual findings to support the extension were supported by competent record evidence. *See Walton v. Ireland*, 2014 ME 130, ¶ 22, 104 A.3d 883. Accordingly, the court did not err when it extended the order that included

provisions prohibiting Morrill from possessing firearms or from initiating legal action against Skolfield.¹

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Daniel Morrill, appellant pro se

Melissa L. Martin, Esq., Pine Tree Legal Assistance, Portland, for appellee Heather Skolfield

Augusta District Court docket number PA-2015-135
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

¹ Morrill additionally argues that the court abused its discretion in denying Morrill's request to recall Skolfield as a rebuttal witness. However, this argument is unpersuasive.