

SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT OF MAINE

State of Maine v. Neil D. Salisbury

2017 ME 215 (2017) · No. Han-17-135 · Decided November 14, 2017

OPINION

State of Maine v. Neil D. Salisbury 2017 ME 215

PER CURIAM.

MAINE SUPREME JUDICIAL COURT Reporter of Decisions Decision: 2017 ME 215 Docket: Han-17-135 Submitted On Briefs: October 24, 2017 Decided: November 14, 2017 Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and MEAD, GORMAN, JABAR, HJELM, and HUMPHREY, JJ.

STATE OF MAINE

v.

NEIL D. SALISBURY

PER CURIAM

[¶1] Neil D. Salisbury appeals from a judgment of conviction of operating after suspension (Class E), 29-A M.R.S. § 2412-A(1-A)(A) (2016), operating without a license (Class E), 29-A M.R.S. § 1251(1)(A) (2016), and operating an unregistered vehicle (Class E), 29-A M.R.S. § 351(1)(B) (2016), entered by the trial court (Hancock County, Mallonee, J.) after a jury found him guilty. On appeal, he primarily challenges the court’s jurisdiction. We affirm the judgment. [¶2] Contrary to Salisbury’s contentions, as a matter of law, the court had both personal and subject matter jurisdiction over this matter. See 15 M.R.S. § 1(1) (2016); 17-A M.R.S. §§ 7(1)(A), (5) (2016); *State v. Pelletier*, 2015 ME 129, ¶ 5, 125 A.3d 354; *State v. St. Onge*, 2011 ME 73, ¶ 13, 21 A.3d 2 1028. During the course of the trial and on appeal, Salisbury also raised other arguments, though he forfeited most of these issues on appeal by failing to offer any legal argument with citation to proper authority. See *Mehlhorn v. Derby*, 2006 ME 110, ¶ 11, 905 A.2d 290. To the extent that he has adequately presented these arguments, we find them without merit. Specifically, • The court did not err or abuse its discretion in quashing Salisbury’s subpoena of the assistant district attorney, who had no relevant evidence to provide, see M.R. Evid. 401, 402; M.R.U. Crim. P. 17; *State v. Watson*, 1999 ME 41, ¶ 5, 726 A.2d 214; • The judge was properly appointed, see *Laprel v. Going*, 2014 ME 84, ¶¶ 15-20, 96 A.3d 67; • The court did not abuse its discretion in reasonably limiting the duration of Salisbury’s opening argument, cf. *State v. Liberty*, 498 A.2d 257, 260 (Me. 1985); • The court properly denied Salisbury’s requested jury instructions and instructed the jury fully on the applicable law, see *State v. Hofland*, 2012 ME 129, ¶ 18, 58 A.3d 1023; • There was no basis for the court to hear a trespass “claim” in the context of a criminal trial, see M.R.U. Crim. P. 12(a) (providing a list of permissible pleadings in a criminal case that does not include counterclaims); cf. M.R. Civ. P. 80F(d)(2) (disallowing counterclaims even in civil traffic

infraction matters); and • There was no interstate travel here, but even if there had been, the right to travel may properly be limited by states to ensure public safety, see *Saenz v. Roe*, 526 U.S. 489, 498 (1999); *Pelletier*, 2015 ME 129, ¶¶ 6-7, 125 A.3d 354; *State v. Elliott*, 2010 ME 3, ¶ 18, 987 A.2d 513; *State v. Quinnam*, 367 A.2d 1032, 1034 (Me. 1977). 3 We discern no error or abuse of discretion and therefore affirm the trial court's judgment. The entry is: Judgment affirmed. Neil D. Salisbury, appellant pro se Toff Toffolon, Dept. Dist. Atty., District Attorney's Office, Ellsworth, for appellee State of Maine Hancock County Unified Criminal Docket docket number CR-2016-624

FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY