

MICHAEL R. DREW

v.

CRAIG SEARS

Submitted on Briefs September 29, 2020
Decided October 6, 2020

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Craig Sears appeals from a judgment entered by the Superior Court (York County, *Douglas, J.*) in favor of Michael R. Drew on Drew’s complaint for breach of contract, after a nonjury trial at which Sears failed to appear. Contrary to Sears’s contentions, the trial record contains sufficient competent evidence to support the court’s findings, *see Wuestenberg v. Rancourt*, 2020 ME 25, ¶ 17, 226 A.3d 227; *Thibeault v. Brackett*, 2007 ME 154, ¶ 14, 938 A.2d 27; *see also Gordon v. Cheskin*, 2013 ME 113, ¶ 12, 82 A.3d 1221 (noting that we will not overturn factual findings on appeal “simply because an alternative finding also finds support in the evidence” (quotation marks omitted)), and none of the court’s evidentiary rulings constitute obvious error, *see* M.R. Evid. 103(a), 801(d)(2), 901(a); M.R. Civ. P. 61; *Teel v. Colson*, 396 A.2d 529, 533-34 (Me. 1979).¹

Further, Sears’s conduct during this litigation was not sufficiently egregious to warrant sanctions. *See* M.R. App. P. 13(f); *Lincoln v. Burbank*,

¹ Sears’s remaining arguments are not persuasive, and we do not address them further.

2016 ME 138, ¶¶ 46-64, 147 A.3d 1165. Drew's motion for sanctions is therefore denied.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed. Motion for sanctions denied.

Craig Sears, appellant pro se

Michael Drew, appellee pro se

York County Superior Court docket number CV-2018-94
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY