

PAT DOE

v.

DAVID R. CLARK

Submitted on Briefs July 13, 2021  
Decided July 20, 2021

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

David R. Clark appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Biddeford, *Moskowitz, J.*) entering a final protection from abuse order against him following an evidentiary hearing on Pat Doe’s complaint. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 4007(1) (2021). Contrary to Clark’s contention, the court did not err in finding that his actions constituted a “course of conduct” within the meaning of 19-A M.R.S. § 4002 (1)(B) (2021), which had the effect of placing Doe in reasonable fear of bodily injury. *See State v. Nastvogel*, 2002 ME 97, ¶¶ 10-11, 798 A.2d 1114; *Jusseume v. Ducatt*, 2011 ME 43, ¶¶ 17-18, 15 A.3d 714. Furthermore, the court did not clearly err or abuse its wide discretion in excluding evidence of Doe’s mental health therapy as irrelevant. *See* M.R. Evid. 402; *Jacob v. Kippax*, 2011 ME 1, ¶ 14, 10 A.3d 1159; *State v. Marquis*, 2017 ME 104, ¶ 13, 162 A.3d 818.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Daniel A. Wentworth, Esq., Law Offices of Dylan Boyd, Portland, for appellant  
David Clark

J. David Canarie, Jr., Esq., Portland, for appellee Pat Doe

Biddeford District Court docket number PA-2020-174  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY