

DANIELLE DILLMAN

v.

WILLIAM GODEK

Argued February 15, 2018

Decided March 22, 2018

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Danielle Dillman appeals from an amended judgment of the District Court (Biddeford, *Janelle, J.*) that denied her complaint for an order of protection from abuse for herself and her minor daughter. 19-A M.R.S. § 4007 (2017). Danielle argues that (1) the court continued to apply an erroneous legal standard when the court clarified that it had “allowed and considered” the daughter’s statements to her therapists but found them unreliable; and that (2) the court abused its discretion by waiting until after the hearing in its written judgment to rule on the admissibility of the therapist’s testimony concerning the daughter’s allegations. Contrary to Danielle’s contentions, the court’s further findings merely clarify that it had, during the hearing, admitted the daughter’s statements, as testified to by her therapist, and the record contains competent evidence from which the court could have reasonably questioned the reliability of the daughter’s statements to her therapist. *See Handrahan v. Malenko*, 2011 ME 15, ¶¶ 19-20, 12 A.3d 79. Because the court did admit the therapist’s testimony concerning the daughter’s allegations when, during the hearing, it overruled William’s objections and allowed the testimony, we affirm the judgment.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Dylan R. Boyd, Esq., and Daniel A. Wentworth, Esq. (orally), Law Offices of Dylan Boyd, Portland, for appellant Danielle Dillman

Gregory J. Orso, Esq. (orally), Orso Law, P.A., York, for appellee William Godek

Biddeford District Court docket number PA-2016-502
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY