

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MAINE

Jaime Soileau v. Eastside Boat Shop et al.

Soileau · No. No. 1:25-cv-00160-JAW · Decided December 5, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Maine grants Jaime Soileau’s motion for attachment and attachment on trustee process against Eastside Boat Shop in the amount of \$275,000. The court denies attachment against the company’s individual owners, Frank P. Coffin II and Mandy Ramsdell-Coffin, concluding that Soileau did not make the required showing for individual liability or corporate veil piercing. The order arises from alleged failures and misrepresentations concerning the construction of a boat.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Maine
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Karen Frink Wolf
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Maine
DECIDED	December 5, 2025
DOCKET	No. 1:25-cv-00160-JAW
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Plaintiff moved for attachment and attachment on trustee process in the amount of \$275,000. The court granted the motion as to Eastside Boat Shop and denied it as to the individual defendants.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 64 and District of Maine Local Rule 64, the court applied Maine attachment law and procedure. The plaintiff had to establish by specific facts that it was more likely than not that he would recover a judgment, including interest and costs, at least equal to the requested attachment. The court reviewed and assigned weight to affidavit evidence as it would to other evidence, but did not need to resolve all factual disputes or complex legal issues in the summary proceeding.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Jaime Soileau v. Eastside Boat Shop, Frank P. Coffin II, Mandy Ramsdell-Coffin

TOPICS

civil procedure default remedies contracts commercial litigation

PRACTICE AREAS

civil procedure commercial litigation contracts corporate law remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Soileau established that it was more likely than not that he would recover at least \$275,000, including interest and costs, so as to support attachment and attachment on trustee process against Eastside Boat Shop.
2. Whether the same showing supported attachment against Frank P. Coffin II and Mandy Ramsdell-Coffin personally.
3. Whether the record sufficiently supported disregarding Eastside Boat Shop's separate corporate identity or establishing individual liability for the defendants' alleged tortious or statutory conduct.

HOLDINGS

1. Attachment and attachment on trustee process were warranted against Eastside Boat Shop because Soileau established that it was more likely than not that he would recover a judgment of at least \$275,000, including interest and costs.
2. Attachment against Frank P. Coffin II and Mandy Ramsdell-Coffin was not warranted because the record did not establish that they were more likely than not personally liable for a judgment of at least \$275,000.
3. The motion did not establish a sufficient likelihood of individual liability for fraudulent misrepresentation, negligent misrepresentation, or violations of the Maine Unfair Trade Practices Act.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The specific facts must establish that it is more likely than not that the plaintiff will recover judgment, including interest and costs, in an amount equal to or greater than the aggregate sum of the attachment”
(Section II)

“The allegations in the complaint and the supporting affidavits demonstrate a dispute between a business and its customer. Such a dispute, by itself, does not warrant abandoning the traditional protections against owner liability afforded by a corporate structure.” (Section II.B)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Soileau contracted with Eastside Boat Shop to build a new boat and paid \$400,000 toward the project. Construction was substantially delayed, the boat remained unfinished, and Soileau ultimately transferred the hull to another boatbuilder after incurring additional expenses. Soileau alleged that the unfinished vessel was worth approximately \$250,000 and that completing the vessel would cost at least \$800,000. He sought attachment of the property of Eastside Boat Shop and its individual officers in the amount of \$275,000.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Soileau filed an action asserting contract, tort, statutory, and restitutionary claims arising from the construction of a boat. The court previously denied an ex parte attachment motion, later entered default against Eastside Boat Shop after it failed to file a responsive pleading, and considered the renewed motion for attachment. The individual defendants opposed the motion, requiring a hearing before attachment of their personal assets could be approved.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- Wilson v. DelPapa, 634 A.2d 1252, 1254 (Me. 1993)
- Porrazzo v. Karofsky, 1998 ME 182, ¶ 7, 714 A.2d 826
- Rowland v. Cal. Men's Colony, Unit II Men's Advisory Council, 506 U.S. 194, 202 (1993)
- Lucas v. RedCoral Invs. LLC, No. 1:24-cv-00350-JAW, 2024 WL 4817463, at *3 (D. Me. Nov. 18, 2024)
- Bonnar-Vawter, Inc. v. Johnson, 173 A.2d 141, 145 (Me. 1961)
- Theberge v. Darbro, Inc., 684 A.2d 1298, 1301 (Me. 1996)
- LaBelle v. Crepeau, 593 A.2d 653, 655 (Me. 1991)
- Johnson v. Exclusive Props. Unlimited, 1998 ME 244, ¶ 6, 720 A.2d 568
- Anderson v. Kennebec River Pulp & Paper Co., 433 A.2d 752, 756 n.5 (Me. 1981)
- Smith v. Devine, 126 F.4th 331, 346 (4th Cir. 2025)
- Tinkham v. Perry, No. 1:12-CV-00229-GZS, 2014 WL 102207, at *2 (D. Me. Jan. 9, 2014)
- Advanced Const. Corp. v. Pilecki, 2006 ME 84, ¶ 13, 901 A.2d 189