

ROBERT KIMBALL

v.

LINDSEY KIMBALL et al.

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

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Robert Kimball appeals from the District Court's (Bridgton, *S. Driscoll, J.*) dismissal of his de facto parenthood petition for lack of standing. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 1891(2) (2021). Contrary to Kimball's contention, the court was not compelled to find that he had standing to proceed with his de facto parenthood petition because he failed to establish (1) that a continuing relationship was in the children's best interests; and (2) that a bonded and dependent relationship existed between himself and the children, that was fostered or supported by the parents, and that the parents accepted or acknowledged him as though he was a parent of the children. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 1891(3)(C), (E) (2021); *In re Child of Philip S.*, 2020 ME 2, ¶¶ 14, 22, 223 A.3d 114; *Libby v. Estabrook*, 2020 ME 71, ¶ 20, 234 A.3d 197.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Stephen H. Shea, Esq., Hanly Law, Portland, for appellant Robert Kimball

Joe Lewis, Esq., Port City Legal, LLC, Portland, for appellees Lindsey Kimball
and Jason Pendexter

Bridgton District Court docket number FM-2020-88
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY