SCOTT CAPARRATTO[1]

v.

JOEL A. KASE

Submitted on Briefs September 21, 2022
Decided September 29, 2022

Panel: STANFILL, C.J., and MEAD, JABAR, HORTON, CONNORS, and LAWRENCE, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Joel A. Kase appeals from a final protection from harassment order entered against him in the District Court (West Bath, *Raimondi, J.*) after a testimonial hearing on Scott Caparratto's complaint. *See* 5 M.R.S. § 4655(1) (2022). Contrary to Kase's contentions, the record contains competent evidence to support the court's finding of harassment. *See* 5 M.R.S. § 4651(2)(A) (2022); *Allen v. Rae*, 2019 ME 53, ¶ 7, 206 A.3d 902; *Cates v. Donahue*, 2007 ME 38, ¶ 11, 916 A.2d 941. Furthermore, the record reveals no restriction on Kase's ability to present evidence during the hearing, and the proceedings did not otherwise violate Kase's right to due process. *See Doe v. Dep't of Health & Hum. Servs.*, 2018 ME 164, ¶ 15, 198 A.3d 782 ("[T]he fundamental requirement of due process is that a party must be given notice and an opportunity to be heard.") Nor do we discern, on the record before us, any conduct by the trial judge that could constitute a violation of the

---

[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 Caparratto in the decision. *See* 18 U.S.C.S. §§ 2261, 2261A, 2265(d)(3), 2266 (LEXIS through Pub. L. No. 117-177).

Maine Code of Judicial Conduct.[2] *See* M. Code Jud. Conduct R. 2.11; *State v. Black*, 2000 ME 211, ¶ 17, 763 A.2d 109; *State v. Rameau*, 685 A.2d 761, 762-63 (Me. 1996).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Joel A. Kase, appellant pro se

Scott Caparratto did not file a brief

West Bath District Court docket numbers PA-2022-02 and PA-2022-16
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

---

[2] To the extent that Kase has raised other arguments, we are unpersuaded, and we do not address them further.