

NADINE J. MAXHAM

v.

KRISTOPHER M. MCFARLIN

Submitted on Briefs June 26, 2019
Decided July 2, 2019

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Kristopher M. McFarlin appeals from a parental rights and responsibilities order entered in the District Court (Newport, *Budd, J.*) regarding his and Nadine J. Maxham's minor children.

Contrary to McFarlin's contentions, the court did not err or abuse its discretion in any of its final determinations, including (1) its factual findings; (2) imputing income to McFarlin in relation to his child support obligation; or (3) making an upward deviation as to McFarlin's child support obligation. *See* 19-A M.R.S. §§ 2001(5)(D), 2007(1), (3) (2018); *Sheikh v. Haji*, 2011 ME 117, ¶ 16, 32 A.3d 1065 ("The trial court is vested with the discretion to impute earning capacity to a parent who voluntarily becomes or remains unemployed or under employed, if sufficient evidence is introduced concerning a party's current earning capacity."); *Dep't of Human Servs. v. Monty*, 2000 ME 96, ¶ 12, 750 A.2d 1276.

To the extent McFarlin raises other issues on appeal, his arguments are either without merit or were not properly raised, and we do not consider them

further. See *Bayview Loan Servicing, LLC v. Bartlett*, 2014 ME 37, ¶ 16, 87 A.3d 741 (stating that issues raised for the first time on appeal are deemed waived); *Teel v. Colson*, 396 A.2d 529, 534 (Me. 1979); see also *Dep't of Environmental Protection v. Woodman*, 1997 ME 164, ¶ 3 n.3, 697 A.2d 1295 (“It is well established that pro se litigants are held to the same standards as represented parties.”).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Kristopher M. McFarlin, appellant pro se

Kenneth W. Fredette, Esq., Newport, for appellee Nadine J. Maxham

Newport District Court docket number FM-2018-109
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY