

JEREMY D. LEE¹

v.

LAWRENCE LASKE

Submitted on Briefs October 21, 2020
Decided October 29, 2020

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Lawrence Laske appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Augusta, *Montgomery, J.*) entering a protection from harassment order on a complaint filed by Jeremy D. Lee. *See* 5 M.R.S. § 4655 (2020). Contrary to Laske's contentions, to the extent that the issues were preserved for appellate review, the court afforded Laske an equal opportunity to participate in the hearing, *see Gallagher v. Penobscot Cmty. Healthcare*, 2019 ME 88, ¶¶ 6-7, 209 A.3d 106, and the court neither erred nor abused its discretion in its management of the hearing. *See* M.R. Evid. 611(a); 16 M.R.S. § 201 (2020); *Jusseume v. Ducatt*, 2011 ME 43, ¶ 12, 15 A.3d 714; *State v. Richard*, 1997 ME 144, ¶ 12, 697 A.2d 410. Furthermore, the court did not abuse its discretion by granting Lee's motion to quash Laske's subpoena commanding the presence of Lee's minor children. *See* M.R. Civ. P. 45(c)(3)(A)(iv); *Berntsen v. Berntsen*, 2017 ME 111, ¶¶ 10-12, 163 A.3d 820. Additionally, the court's finding that Laske had committed an act of harassment against Lee within the meaning of

¹ Cognizant of the federal Violence Against Women Act, we note that this matter does not involve a judicial determination that domestic violence or stalking occurred, and we therefore name Lee in the decision. *See* 18 U.S.C.S. §§ 2261, 2261A, 2265(d)(3), 2266 (LEXIS through Pub. L. No. 116-169).

5 M.R.S. § 4651(2)(C) (2020), *see* 17-A M.R.S. §§ 207(1)(A), 209(1) (2020), was supported by competent evidence in the record. *See Allen v. Rae*, 2019 ME 53, ¶¶ 7-9, 206 A.3d 902.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Lawrence Laske, appellant pro se

Jeremy D. Lee did not file a brief

Augusta District Court docket number PA-2019-443
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY