

DAVID HARDINGHAM

v.

MARY JANE REITH

Submitted on Briefs March 24, 2003  
Decided March 31, 2003

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and CLIFFORD, DANA, ALEXANDER, CALKINS,  
and LEVY, JJ.

#### MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

David Hardingham appeals from the order of the District Court (Biddeford, *Kennedy, J.*) which denied his post-divorce motion to enforce, granted Mary Jane Reith's motion to enforce and ordered Hardingham to pay Reith \$12,402.03 within thirty days of the court's May 3, 2002, order. Hardingham alleges that the court erred in providing him insufficient guidance as to the procedures to follow for hearing and insufficient notice and opportunity to participate in the May 1, 2002, hearing, which led to the court's order.

Considering the history of the case indicated in the record, Hardingham's claim that he was not sufficiently notified that his request for continuance had been denied and that he was otherwise denied reasonable accommodation to allow his participation in the hearing is without any good basis. The District Court acted appropriately in notifying Hardingham of the hearing date and that his request for continuance had been denied and in attempting a reasonable accommodation, which Hardingham forfeited by electing not to be available by phone, as he himself had requested. In addition, the court's determinations with regard to the competing post-divorce motions to enforce are sufficiently supported in the record.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

For the appellant:

David Hardingham  
88 E. Cliff St., Apt. 5  
Somerville, New Jersey 08876

Attorney for the appellee:

Judith M. Wohl, Esq.  
103 Exchange St.  
Portland, Maine 04101