

N.G.P.

v.

G.D.P.

Submitted on Briefs May 30, 2019
Decided June 6, 2019

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

G.D.P. appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Newport, *Budd, J.*) entering a one-year extension of an order for protection from abuse. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 4007(2) (2018). G.D.P. submits several arguments related to pretrial procedure, service of process, the court's examination of witnesses, and the sufficiency of the evidence to support the court's findings of abuse.

Contrary to the contentions of G.D.P., there is nothing in the record that demonstrates defective service of process or an abuse of discretion in the court's scheduling and administering the hearing on the pending motion to dissolve and motion to extend. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 4006(1) (2018); M.R. Civ. P. 4(c)(2); *see also Jeffs v. Dennis*, 2007 ME 129, ¶¶ 1, 4, 931 A.2d 1055. Furthermore, G.D.P. did not object to, and the record does not reveal, an abuse of discretion in the court's examination of witnesses pursuant to M.R. Evid. 614(b). *See State v. Philbrick*, 669 A.2d 152, 156 (Me. 1995); *State v. Pickering*, 491 A.2d 560, 564 (Me. 1985). Lastly, there is sufficient competent evidence in the record to support the court's findings of abuse pursuant to the protection from abuse statute. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 4002(1)(A) (2018); *Doe v.*

Tierney, 2018 ME 101, ¶¶ 15-18, 189 A.3d 756; *Walton v. Ireland*, 2014 ME 130, ¶ 22, 104 A.3d 883; *Smith v. Hawthorne*, 2002 ME 149, ¶ 16, 804 A.2d 1133.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

G.D.P., appellant pro se

N.G.P. did not file a brief

Newport District Court docket number PA-2016-103
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY