

PAT DOE<sup>1</sup>

v.

BRENDON M. TANSEY

Submitted on Briefs December 21, 2021  
Decided January 18, 2022

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

## MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Brendon M. Tansey appeals from judgments entered in the District Court (Biddeford, *Moskowitz, J.*) granting Pat Doe’s request for a protection from abuse order, granting Doe’s motion to modify the parties’ parental rights and responsibilities with respect to their minor child, and denying Tansey’s motion for contempt.

Contrary to Tansey’s arguments, competent evidence supports the court’s findings of abuse and the court did not clearly err in granting Doe’s request for a protection from abuse order. *See Deah v. Cuthbert*, 2018 ME 34, ¶ 14, 180 A.3d 1087; 19-A M.R.S. § 4007 (2021); 19-A M.R.S. § 4002(1) (2021). Nor did the court clearly err or abuse its discretion in modifying the parties’ parental rights and responsibilities, *see Seymour v. Seymour*, 2021 ME 60, ¶ 22,

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to federal law, we do not identify the plaintiff in this appeal involving a protection from abuse 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. 117-80).

--- A.3d ---; 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(3), (6) (2021); 19-A M.R.S. § 1657 (2021), because the court’s findings were based on competent evidence, *see Jackson v. MacLeod*, 2014 ME 110, ¶¶ 10, 21, 100 A.3d 484; *Vibert v. Dimoulas*, 2017 ME 62, ¶¶ 15, 17, 159 A.3d 325. Although Tansey argues that the court failed to take the child’s best interest into account, he did not move for findings of fact and conclusions of law, and we therefore assume the court “made all the findings necessary to support its judgment.” *Young v. Young*, 2015 ME 89, ¶ 5, 120 A.3d 106 (quotation marks omitted); *see Grant v. Hamm*, 2012 ME 79, ¶ 13, 48 A.3d 789.<sup>2</sup>

The entry is:

Judgments affirmed.

---

Brendon M. Tansey, appellant pro se

Melissa L. Martin, Esq., Pine Tree Legal Assistance, Portland, for appellee Pat Doe

Biddeford District Court docket numbers FM-2018-46 and PA-2021-85  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

---

<sup>2</sup> Tansey failed to properly develop and thus waived any argument regarding the court’s denial of his motion for contempt. *See Mehlhorn v. Derby*, 2006 ME 110, ¶¶ 9, 11, 905 A.2d 290; Alexander, *Maine Appellate Practice* § 404 at 316 (5th ed. 2018). Regardless, the court did not clearly err or abuse its discretion in denying his motion. *See Ames v. Ames*, 2003 ME 60, ¶¶ 21-25, 822 A.2d 1201; *see also* 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(7) (2021). Tansey’s other arguments are either not properly developed, *see Mehlhorn*, 2006 ME 110, ¶¶ 9, 11, 905 A.2d 290, or not persuasive, and we do not address them further.