

PAT DOE<sup>1</sup>

v.

SIQI LU

Submitted on Briefs January 7, 2025  
Decided January 14, 2025

Panel: STANFILL, C.J., and MEAD, HORTON, CONNORS, LAWRENCE, and DOUGLAS, JJ.

## MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

SiQi Lu appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Belfast, *E. Walker, J.*) finding her in contempt of a protection from abuse order entered against her and in favor of Pat Doe. Contrary to Lu's contentions, the trial court did not err or abuse its discretion by denying her request for court-appointed counsel. *See Douris v. New Jersey*, 500 F. App'x 98, 101 (3d Cir. 2012); *Meyer v. Meyer*, 414 A.2d 236, 239 (Me. 1980). Furthermore, the trial court accorded Lu due process throughout the proceeding. *See Jusseaume v. Ducatt*, 2011 ME 43, ¶ 12, 15 A.3d 714 ("When significant rights are at stake, due process requires: notice of the issues, an opportunity to be heard, the right to introduce evidence and present witnesses, the right to respond to claims and evidence, and an impartial fact-finder." (quotation marks omitted)); *Adoption by Jessica M.*,

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to federal law, we do not identify the plaintiff of a protection-from-abuse order and limit any description of events and locations to avoid revealing "the identity or location of the party protected under [a protection] order" as required by 18 U.S.C.A. § 2265(d)(3) (Westlaw through Pub. L. No. 118-157). *See Doe v. Tierney*, 2018 ME 101, n.1, 189 A.3d 756.

2020 ME 118, ¶ 12, 239 A.3d 633 (observing that “the court’s process struck a fair balance among the competing concerns”).<sup>2</sup>

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

SiQi Lu, appellant pro se

With leave of the Court, Pat Doe did not file a brief

Belfast District Court docket number PA-2023-193  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

---

<sup>2</sup> Lu makes numerous other arguments on appeal that we do not find persuasive.