

GUARDIANSHIP BY RENEE M.

Submitted on Briefs December 30, 2024  
Decided January 7, 2025

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Renee M. and her husband appeal from a judgment entered by the District Court (Biddeford, *Duddy, J.*) terminating their co-guardianship and appointing a new guardian for their grandchild. *See* 18-C M.R.S. § 5-210(4) (2024). Contrary to their contention, the court did not err when it considered reunification with the child’s parents as a factor in its best interest of the child analysis because a plain reading of 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(3) (2024) indicates the Legislature intended to permit the court to consider a variety of factors related to parental control, care, and access. *See Bulkley v. Bulkley*, 2013 ME 101, ¶ 14, 82 A.3d 116. Furthermore, on this record the court did not abuse its discretion in determining that terminating the guardianship and appointing a new guardian was in the best interest of the child. 18-C M.R.S. § 5-210(4); *In re Guardianship of Stevens*, 2014 ME 25, ¶ 16, 86 A.3d 1197. Additionally, the court did not abuse its discretion or clearly err when it excluded three of the co-guardians’ exhibits at the hearing. *See* M.R. Evid 403; *State v. Jones*, 2019 ME 33, ¶ 18, 203 A.3d 816.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Jeffrey S. Dolley, Esq., Lewiston, for appellants Renee and Robert M.

Bruce W. Hepler, Esq., Law Offices of Bruce W. Hepler, LLC, Portland, for  
appellee petitioner

Mary-Ann L. Letourneau, Esq., Holmes Legal Group, LLC, Wells, for appellee  
father

Biddeford District Court docket numbers FM-2021-366 and FM-2023-57  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY