

STATE OF MAINE

v.

RALPH H. MATHIS III

Submitted on Briefs October 18, 2023
Decided November 2, 2023

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Ralph H. Mathis III appeals from an adjudication by the Violations Bureau (*Goranites, A.R.J.*) finding Mathis committed two traffic violations—failing to display a current and valid inspection sticker and operating a motor vehicle at a speed that exceeds the maximum posted speed limit—and assessing a \$220 fine. *See* 29-A M.R.S. §§ 1768(7), 2073(3) (2023). Mathis did not provide a transcript of the proceedings below, so we must assume the court’s findings are correct. *See Putnam v. Albee*, 1999 ME 44, ¶ 10, 726 A.2d 217. Contrary to Mathis’s contentions, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the State, the court could rationally find that (1) Mathis failed to display a current and valid inspection sticker, and (2) Mathis drove sixty-two miles per hour in a zone with a fifty-five miles per hour posted speed limit.¹ 29-A M.R.S. §§

¹ Mathis also argues, inter alia, that he “lack[ed] [] knowledge and understanding of the laws” and an executive order suspended the inspection sticker requirement. We find Mathis’s arguments unpersuasive. *See generally* 29-A M.R.S. § 1768 (2023); *Official Documents*, State of Maine: Office of Governor Janet T. Mills, https://www.maine.gov/governor/mills/official_documents (last visited Nov. 1, 2023).

1768(7), 2073(3); see *State v. Palmer*, 2017 ME 183, ¶ 7, 169 A.3d 425; *Putnam*, 1999 ME 44, ¶ 10, 726 A.2d 217. Further, we decline to reach Mathis's due process claims because he failed to articulate the procedural harms he allegedly suffered.² See *Melhorn v. Derby*, 2006 ME 110, ¶ 11, 905 A.2d 290.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Ralph H. Mathis III, appellant pro se

The State of Maine did not file a brief

Violations Bureau case number 5066711
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

² Regardless, the alleged process infirmities do not rise to the level of a violation of due process. See *In re Child of Kenneth S.*, 2022 ME 14, ¶ 16, 269 A.3d 242; *Light v. Town of Livermore*, No. 1:21-cv-00266-JAW, 2022 WL 4016809, at *26 (D. Me. Sept. 2, 2022) (“[T]here is a rational relationship between use of Zoom and the government’s interest in reducing gather[ing]s of people to limit the spread of Covid-19.”); *Vazquez Diaz v. Commonwealth*, 167 N.E.3d 822, 832 (Mass. 2021) (concluding a virtual motion to suppress hearing is not a per se violation of the defendant’s right to be present).