

JOSEPH N. GLIDDEN

v.

TYLER M. VAILLANCOURT

Submitted on Briefs January 17, 2019  
Decided January 24, 2019

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

#### MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Tyler M. Vaillancourt appeals from a judgment of the District Court (South Paris, *Carlson, J.*) modifying her and Joseph N. Glidden's parental rights and responsibilities as to their minor child and amending a prior protection from abuse order Vaillancourt had obtained against Glidden on behalf of the child. Contrary to Vaillancourt's contentions, the court did not err or abuse its discretion in any of its final determinations, including (1) its factual findings; (2) in allowing Glidden limited contact with the child; or (3) in amending Glidden's child support obligation.<sup>1</sup> See 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(1)(C), (2), (3), (5-A) (2017); *Pearson v. Ellis-Gross*, 2015 ME 118, ¶ 4, 123 A.3d 223; *Young v. Young*, 2015 ME 89, ¶ 5, 120 A.3d 106; *Buck v. Buck*, 2015 ME 33, ¶¶ 5-6, 113 A.3d 1095. The court also did not abuse its discretion when it denied Vaillancourt's motion for a continuance of the evidentiary hearing, to the extent such a request was made. See M.R. Civ. P. 40(c); *Hero v. Macomber*, 2016 ME 4, ¶ 7, 130 A.3d 398.

---

<sup>1</sup> Vaillancourt's assertion of error regarding child support arrearage is not preserved, and therefore we do not consider it. See *Berg v. Bragdon*, 1997 ME 129, ¶ 9, 695 A.2d 1212; see also 19-A §§ 2102, 2601, 2603 (2017). If she wishes to have a court consider the alleged arrearage, she must file a motion to enforce.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Tyler M. Vaillancourt, appellant pro se

Joseph N. Glidden did not file a brief

South Paris District Court docket number FM-2014-127  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY