

PAT DOE<sup>1</sup>

v.

CARLOS CASTRO

Submitted on Briefs December 18, 2020  
Decided December 29, 2020

Panel: MEAD, GORMAN, JABAR, HORTON, and CONNORS, JJ.

## MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Carlos Castro appeals from a protection from abuse order entered by the District Court (Belfast, *Davis, J.*) on a complaint filed by Pat Doe individually and on behalf of her minor child. Contrary to Castro's contentions, the trial court did not err in ruling on Castro's objections during the direct examination of Doe's minor child, *see State v. Hansen*, 2020 ME 43, ¶ 17, 228 A.3d 1082, and the court did not err or abuse its discretion in making a determination of abuse based on credible testimony and competent record evidence, *see Dyer v. Superintendent of Ins.*, 2013 ME 61, ¶ 12, 69 A.3d 416.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

<sup>1</sup> To comply with federal law, we do not identify the plaintiff in this protection from abuse action and limit our description of events and locations to avoid revealing "the identity or location of the party protected under [a protection] order" as required by 18 U.S.C.S. § 2265(d)(3) (LEXIS through Pub. L. No. 116-141).

Patricia V. Shadis, Esq., Patricia Shadis Law Office P.A., Newcastle, for appellant  
Carlos Castro

Jeremy M. Marden, Esq., Mailloux & Marden, P.A., Belfast, for appellee Pat Doe

Belfast District Court docket number PA-2020-56  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY