

ROBERT J. TARBOX et al.

v.

STEPHEN W. BLAISDELL et al.

Submitted on Briefs September 23, 2010

Decided October 7, 2010

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and ALEXANDER, SILVER, MEAD, and JABAR, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Robert J. Tarbox, Corrie A. Tarbox, Catherine M. Tarbox, and Philip J. Tarbox appeal from a judgment of the Superior Court (York County, *Fritzsche, J.*) that recalculated, in accordance with the mandate on remand of the earlier appeal in this matter, the dimensions of the adjacent, unaccepted way that was deemed part of the Tarboxs's fee ownership. *Tarbox v. Blaisdell*, 2009 ME 123, ¶ 15, 984 A.2d 1273, 1277. Contrary to the Tarboxs's contentions, the Superior Court did not err in applying our decision on remand. The remainder of the Tarboxs's arguments are not reviewable at this juncture as they concern matters beyond the scope of the Superior Court's prerogative under the clearly circumscribed terms of the Mandate or are otherwise resolved by the application of the doctrine of *stare decisis*. As such, we decline to address them. *Bourgeois v. Great N. Nekoosa Corp.*, 1999 ME 10, ¶¶ 5-6, 722 A.2d 369, 371.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Attorney for the Tarboxes:

Thomas Danylik, Esq.
Sandra L. Guay, Esq.
Woodman Edmands Danylik & Austin, P.A.
PO Box 468
Biddeford, Maine 04005

**Attorney for Stephen W. Blaisdell,
Susan M. Blaisdell, and Sarah Blaisdell:**

David A. Soley, Esq.
Glenn Israel, Esq.
Daniel J. Edwards, Esq.
Bernstein Shur
100 Middle Street
PO Box 9729
Portland, Maine 04104-5029