

JANE DOE¹

v.

GLEN PLOURDE

Submitted on Briefs February 24, 2021
Decided March 4, 2021

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Glen Plourde appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Waterville, Dow, J.) granting Jane Doe's motion for an extension of a protection from harassment order. Contrary to Plourde's contentions, we discern no error or abuse of discretion in the court's determination, by a preponderance of the evidence, that an extension of the protection order was "necessary to protect [Doe] from harassment." 5 M.R.S. § 4655(2) (2020); *see Doe v. Plourde*, 2019 ME 109, ¶¶ 6, 8, 211 A.3d 1153, *cert. denied*, 140 S. Ct. 653 (2019); *Doe v. Tierney*, 2018 ME 101, ¶¶ 12, 15, 19, 189 A.3d 756. The court also acted within its discretion in scheduling the hearing and managing the presentation of evidence. *See* M.R. Civ. P. 16A(a), 40(b)(2), 43(a); *Plourde*, 2019 ME 109, ¶ 7, 211 A.3d 1153; *Kuperman v. Eiras*, 586 A.2d 1260, 1263 (Me. 1991). Finally, the record discloses no suggestion that the trial judge violated any provision of the Maine Code of Judicial Conduct in conducting the hearing in this matter. *See Schafer v. Schafer*, 2019 ME 101, ¶¶ 6-8, 210 A.3d 842.

¹ To comply with federal law, we do not identify the plaintiff in this protection from harassment action and limit our description of events and locations to avoid revealing "the identity or location of the party protected under [a protection] order." 18 U.S.C.S. § 2265(d)(3) (LEXIS through Pub. L. No. 116-259).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Glen Plourde, appellant pro se

Jade Richards, Esq., Pine Tree Legal Assistance, Augusta, for appellee Jane Doe

Waterville District Court docket number PA-2018-329
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

MAINE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT
Sitting as the Law Court

Docket No. Ken-20-217
Decision No. Mem 21-16

Jane Doe

v.

**ORDER DENYING MOTION
TO RECONSIDER**


Glen Plourde

Glen Plourde has filed a motion to reconsider the Court's decision dated March 4, 2021. The motion has been reviewed by the panel that decided the original appeal.

The motion to reconsider is DENIED.

Dated: March 23, 2021

For the Court,



Matthew Pollack
Clerk of the Law Court
Pursuant to M.R. App. P. 12A(b)(4)