

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

<b>LINDA L. LAMPRON,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>PLAINTIFF</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>CIVIL No. 09-477-P-H</b>
	)	
<b>POSTMASTER GENERAL,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>DEFENDANT</b>	)	

**ORDER ON PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR JUDGMENT AS A MATTER OF LAW  
OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE, MOTION FOR NEW TRIAL**

The plaintiff’s motion for judgment as a matter of law or, in the alternative, motion for a new trial is **DENIED**.

The motion for judgment as a matter of law under Fed. R. Civ. P. 50 is **DENIED** as untimely, because it was not made before the close of all the evidence. Fed. R. Civ. P. 50(a). Zachar v. Lee, 363 F.3d 70, 74 (1st Cir. 2004). The motion for a new trial under Rule 59 is **DENIED** because the jury was entitled to conclude that adverse employment action was not taken for a retaliatory reason. The evidence was well and thoroughly presented by both parties, and the jury resolved their conflicting views as to what inferences to draw. There is no reason to upset that verdict.

**SO ORDERED.**

**DATED THIS 15<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2011**

/s/D. Brock Hornby  
\_\_\_\_\_  
**D. BROCK HORNBY**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MAINE (PORTLAND)  
CIVIL DOCKET NO. 2:09cv477 (DBH)**

**Linda L. Lampron,**

**Plaintiff**

Represented By **Guy D. Loranger**  
Nichols, Webb & Loranger, P.A.  
110 Main Street, Suite 1520  
Saco, ME 04072  
(207) 283-6400  
email: [guy@nicholswebb.com](mailto:guy@nicholswebb.com)

**v.**

**Postmaster General,**

**Defendant**

Represented By **Evan J. Roth**  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Office of the United States Attorney  
100 Middle Street Plaza  
Portland, ME 04101  
(207) 780-3257  
email: [evan.roth@usdoj.gov](mailto:evan.roth@usdoj.gov)