

PAT DOE¹

v.

VIKTOR GARNIK

Submitted on Briefs December 21, 2021
Decided January 4, 2022

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Viktor Garnik appeals from a divorce judgment of the District Court (Biddeford, *Moskowitz, J.*), as well as a judgment granting Pat Doe’s motion to extend a protection from abuse order. Contrary to Viktor’s contentions, the court did not abuse its discretion when it denied Viktor’s motion to continue, *see In re Arturo G.*, 2017 ME 228, ¶ 14, 175 A.3d 91; *In re Trevor I.*, 2009 ME 59, ¶ 28, 973 A.2d 752, nor did the court abuse its discretion when it granted Viktor’s attorney’s motion to withdraw, *see Blessing v. Dow Chemical Co.*, 521 A.2d 1176, 1179 (Me. 1987); *In re J.R.*, 2013 ME 58, ¶ 19, 69 A.3d 406. Furthermore, Viktor waived the issue of whether the court relied on hearsay evidence regarding his income because he stated that he had no objection to the evidence’s admission at the final hearing. *Cyr v. Cyr*, 432 A.2d 793, 797-98 (Me. 1981). Lastly, the court did not err when it extended Doe’s protection order against Viktor because the record contained sufficient evidence to

¹ To comply with federal law, this Court refers to persons protected by a protection order by the pseudonym “Pat Doe.”

support the court's extension. *See Doe v. Tierney*, 2018 ME 101, ¶ 19, 189 A.3d 756; *Dyer v. Dyer*, 2010 ME 105, ¶ 11, 5 A.3d 1049.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Sheilah R. McLaughlin, Esq., Cape Elizabeth, for appellant Viktor Garnik

Christopher P. Leddy, Esq., Ainsworth, Thelin & Raftice, P.A., South Portland, for
appellee Pat Doe

Biddeford District Court docket numbers FM-2019-380 & PA-2019-497
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY