



their property following tax lien foreclosure by paying all the taxes due, but has refused to allow the Defendant to do the same. The Defendant claims that the Town has acted in this manner because it is an out-of-state corporation. The Town concedes that it has allowed other prior owners to repurchase their properties and has refused to allow the Defendant to do so. In support of this decision, the Town has submitted record evidence to show that it refused to allow the property to be repurchased unless all sums due to the Town from the Defendant and other related corporate entities were paid.

Both parties cite to Aucella v. Winslow, 628 A.2d 120 in support of their position. In Aucella, the Law Court discussed application of equal protection in circumstances such as those in this case:

The law of equal protection allows for the unequal enforcement of a law or policy among similarly situated individuals if there is a rational basis for the distinction that is related to a legitimate state purpose. The selective enforcement of a facially neutral policy may provide grounds for an equal protection claim only if there exists "an element of intentional or purposeful discrimination." Nonresidence of a state, town, or locality is not a permissible basis for different treatment of property owners absent a legitimate reason for the distinction.

Id. at 124.

In this case, the Town has come forward with unrebutted, admissible record evidence<sup>2</sup> that shows that it had a rational basis to treat the Defendant differently from other taxpayers and that the distinction was based on a legitimate governmental purpose – collecting amounts due. Though the Defendant correctly points out that one corporate entity cannot be held liable for the debts and obligations of another, which is not material to the issue here. The record establishes that there is a relationship between three corporate entities, including the Defendant, which owed funds to the Town. Using leverage that a municipality has against one entity in an attempt to recover from a related entity is a rational choice and does not amount to a violation of anyone's constitutional rights.

For these reasons, the Town is entitled to judgment as matter of law. Judgment is entered for the Plaintiff and a decree is entered confirming the Town of Wiscasset's title to the property at issue.

Dated: May 18, 2015

  
JUSTICE, MAINE SUPERIOR COURT

---

<sup>2</sup> Though the Defendant's filings argue that there is a dispute of material fact on this issue, counsel conceded that there was not during oral argument. In any case, this court has concluded that there is no dispute of material fact, simply a dispute regarding which facts are material and the legal conclusion that should be drawn from those facts.

SUPERIOR COURT  
LINCOLN, ss.  
Docket No WISSC-RE-2014-00004

**DOCKET RECORD**

TOWN OF WISCASSET - PLAINTIFF  
51 BATH ROAD  
WISCASSET ME 04578

Attorney for: TOWN OF WISCASSET  
GEOFFREY HOLE - RETAINED 02/13/2014  
BERNSTEIN SHUR SAWYER & NELSON  
100 MIDDLE ST  
PO BOX 9729  
PORTLAND ME 04104-5029

vs

FERRY ROAD DEVELOPMENT LLC - DEFENDANT  
485 WEST PUTNAM AVENUE  
GREENWICH CT 06830

Attorney for: FERRY ROAD DEVELOPMENT LLC  
WALDEMAR BUSCHMANN - RETAINED  
WEEKS & HUTCHINS LLC  
TWO PARK PLACE  
PO BOX 417  
WATERVILLE ME 04903-0417

Attorney for: FERRY ROAD DEVELOPMENT LLC  
READE ELLIOTT WILSON - RETAINED  
DRUMMOND WOODSUM  
84 MARGINAL WAY SUITE 600

PORTLAND ME 04101-2480

Attorney for: FERRY ROAD DEVELOPMENT LLC  
BRIAN D WILLING - RETAINED  
DRUMMOND WOODSUM  
84 MARGINAL WAY SUITE 600

PORTLAND ME 04101-2480

TD BANK NA - DEFENDANT  
ONE PORTLAND SQUARE  
PORTLAND ME 04101

Attorney for: TD BANK NA  
KENNETH PIERCE - RETAINED  
MONAGHAN LEAHY LLP  
95 EXCHANGE ST  
PO BOX 7046  
PORTLAND ME 04112-7046

Filing Document: COMPLAINT  
Filing Date: 02/13/2014

Minor Case Type: EQUITABLE REMEDIES

Docket Events:

02/14/2014 FILING DOCUMENT - COMPLAINT FILED ON 02/13/2014

02/14/2014 Party(s): TOWN OF WISCASSET