

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS

A25-1366

In the Matter of:

Rachel Alicia Warns-Ledesma, petitioner,

Respondent,

vs.

Duran Printiss Mayfield,

Appellant.

ORDER OPINION

Ramsey County District Court
File No. 62-DA-FA-25-399

Considered and decided by Bond, Presiding Judge; Reyes, Judge; and Harris, Judge.

BASED ON THE FILE, RECORD, AND PROCEEDINGS, AND BECAUSE:

1. Appellant-father Duran Printiss Mayfield appeals from a district court order granting respondent-mother Rachel Alicia Warns-Ledesma’s petition for an order for protection (OFP) against him. Mother did not file a brief, and this court ordered that the appeal proceed under Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 142.03 (providing that if a respondent fails to file a brief, the case shall be determined on the merits).

2. In May 2025, mother filed a petition for an OFP against father on behalf of herself and the parties’ minor child. The May 2025 petition alleged that in November 2024, father had “chased [mother] around” in his vehicle until she arrived at her place of employment, where he threatened to “kill [her] for keeping [the child] from him.” The petition also alleged that father had harassed mother by repeatedly calling her place of

employment and waiting by her car until she got off work. Lastly, the petition alleged that father had harassed mother's family members and that mother was fearful father would go to the child's school and "try to take her" away. The district court issued an emergency ex parte OFP on behalf of mother and scheduled an evidentiary hearing.

3. At the evidentiary hearing, both parties appeared in person and it appears that mother called at least one other witness in addition to herself. After the hearing, the district court found that domestic abuse had occurred and issued an OFP in favor of mother. The district court found that "[mother] and [mother's witness] credibly testified that [father] had followed [mother] to her place of work during November 2024 in his vehicle" and that "[mother] is reasonably in fear of physical harm from [father]."

4. Father argues that mother lied about the alleged incident of domestic abuse during the evidentiary hearing, and therefore there was not sufficient credible evidence to support the district court's issuance of an OFP against him.

5. A district court may issue an OFP upon a finding of domestic abuse." *Butler v. Jakes*, 977 N.W.2d 867, 871 (Minn. App. 2022) (quotation omitted); see Minn. Stat. § 518B.01, subds. 4, 6 (2024). As relevant here, domestic abuse occurs when a family or household member "inflict[s] . . . fear of imminent physical harm, bodily injury, or assault" against another family or household member. Minn Stat. § 518B.01, subd. 2(a)(2) (2024). Appellant does not dispute that he is a family or household member as defined by the Minnesota Domestic Abuse Act. See *id.*, subd. 2(b) (2024).

6. We review a district court's grant of an OFP for an abuse of discretion. *Ekman v. Miller*, 812 N.W.2d 892, 895 (Minn. App. 2012). A district court abuses its

discretion when it makes findings unsupported by the record or when it misapplies the law. *Pechovnik v. Pechovnik*, 765 N.W.2d 94, 98 (Minn. App. 2009).

7. “Appellate courts cannot presume error by the district court, and the complaining party has the obligation to provide the appellate court with a record sufficient to show any alleged error.” *Butler*, 977 N.W.2d at 873. It is the appellant’s responsibility to provide any necessary transcripts on appeal. See Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 110.02, subd. 1(a) (requiring the appellant to order any necessary transcripts); *Minneapolis Cmty. Dev. Agency v. Mark Lee Prods., Inc.*, 411 N.W.2d 599, 601 (Minn. App. 1987) (“The appellant bears the burden of providing an adequate record on appeal.”). Here, father failed to order transcripts from any of the hearings in this matter. We recognize that father is self-represented on appeal, “but that does not relieve [father] of the necessity of providing an adequate record and preserving it in a way that will permit review.” *Thorp Loan & Thrift Co. v. Morse*, 451 N.W.2d 361, 363 (Minn. App. 1990), *rev. denied* (Minn. Apr. 13, 1990); *see also Fischer v. Simon*, 980 N.W.2d 142, 144 (Minn. 2022) (noting the duty to order a transcript applies to self-represented appellants). “While the lack of a transcript does not automatically require dismissal of an entire appeal, lack of a transcript does limit the scope of appellate review to whether the district court’s conclusions of law are supported by its findings of fact.” *Bender v. Bender*, 671 N.W.2d 602, 605 (Minn. App. 2003).

8. The district court’s legal conclusion that father committed domestic abuse against mother by placing her in reasonable fear of physical harm is supported by its findings of fact. The district court found that mother and mother’s witness “credibly

testified that [father] had followed [mother] to her place of work during November 2024 in his vehicle.” While father attacks mother’s credibility and disputes that domestic abuse occurred, we must defer to the district court’s credibility determinations. *Butler*, 977 N.W.2d at 871; *see Sefkow v. Sefkow*, 427 N.W.2d 203, 210 (Minn. 1988) (“Deference must be given to the opportunity of the trial court to assess the credibility of the witnesses.”). Because the district court’s findings of fact provide sufficient support for the conclusion that domestic abuse occurred, the district court did not abuse its discretion in granting the OFP. *See Pechovnik*, 765 N.W.2d at 98; *see also Butler*, 977 N.W.2d at 871.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

1. The district court’s order is affirmed.
2. Pursuant to Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c), this order opinion is nonprecedential, except as law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel.

Dated: 4/24/26

BY THE COURT



Judge Rachel F. Bond