

JOHN PAUL WILLIAMSON II

v.

AMANDA M. ANGELL

Submitted on Briefs February 19, 2025
Decided February 27, 2025

Panel: MEAD, HORTON, CONNORS, LAWRENCE, and DOUGLAS, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Amanda M. Angell appeals from a divorce judgment by the District Court (Augusta, *Dufour, J.*) entered on July 15, 2024. Angell argues that the court (1) abused its discretion when it denied Angell’s motion to continue the final hearing so that she could find an attorney; (2) abused its discretion when it refused to admit financial evidence from Angell as a sanction for not filing her financial statement by the court’s deadline; and (3) erred in its determination of the value of certain household tools as part of the parties’ property division.

We conclude that the court did not err or abuse its discretion. First, we conclude that Angell had sufficient time to find an attorney before the final hearing because she received seven weeks’ notice of the hearing date. Therefore, she did not establish a substantial reason for the court to grant a continuance nor was she prejudiced by the court’s decision. *See Daud v. Abdullahi*, 2015 ME 48, ¶ 6, 115 A.3d 77 (concluding that the party’s “failure to retain an attorney when he had eight days to do so is not a substantial reason that would compel the court to grant a continuance.”).

Second, we determine that the court's refusal to admit financial evidence from Angell was a reasonable sanction given Angell's failure to file her financial statement on time after having been given an extended deadline to do so, and given Angell's repeated lack of response to discovery requests over the course of the parties' proceedings. *See* M.R. Civ. P. 37(b)(2)(B); *Harshman v. Harshman*, 2017 ME 60, ¶ 17, 158 A.3d 506.

Lastly, we conclude that the evidence was sufficient to support the court's valuation of the household tools in the court's property division. *See* Levy, Maine Family Law § 7.8[1]. However, we note that there is a clerical error in the court's final judgment—the amount that Angell is ordered to pay Williamson regarding the household tools that are marital property reflects one-fourth of those tools' value, where the evidence and the court's reasoning demonstrate that that amount should reflect one-half of those tools' value. Accordingly, the court should address this error. *See* M.R. Civ. P. 60(a). Angell's additional arguments lack merit.

The entry is:

Remanded with instructions to correct the clerical error per M.R. Civ. P. 60(a). Judgment affirmed in all other respects.

Amanda M. Angell, appellant pro se

Jed Davis, Esq., Augusta, for appellee John P. Williamson II