

*This opinion is nonprecedential except as provided by
Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 136.01, subd. 1(c).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A25-1934**

In the Matter of:

Esteisy Alejandra Mattin
and on behalf of Minor Child, petitioner,
Appellant,

vs.

Corey Deangelo Mattin,
Respondent.

**Filed June 29, 2026
Affirmed
Schmidt, Judge**

Hennepin County District Court
File No. 27-DA-FA-25-4675

Michelle K. Kuhl, Lommen Abdo, P.A., Minneapolis, Minnesota (for appellant)

Corey Deangelo Mattin, Minneapolis, Minnesota (pro se respondent)

Considered and decided by Larson, Presiding Judge; Wheelock, Judge; and
Schmidt, Judge.

NONPRECEDENTIAL OPINION

SCHMIDT, Judge

Appellant-mother Esteisy Alejandra Mattin challenges the district court's order denying her petition for an order for protection (OFP). We affirm.

FACTS

Mother petitioned for an OFP against respondent-father Corey DeAngelo Mattin on behalf of herself and the parties' daughter. The district court issued an ex parte OFP. Father denied the allegations and requested an evidentiary hearing.

At the hearing, mother testified that her relationship with father had a history of domestic abuse. Mother alleged three instances of abuse: father putting her in a chokehold; father kicking down a door; and father threatening to harm her. Father testified and answered questions about each alleged incident.

After testimony finished, the district court made the following record:

THE COURT: There is a lot going on here . . . But I got to say also what raises red flags for me is that there was a lot of important details I did not hear from the petitioner that put a lot of this stuff in context, and as the petitioner you have the burden of proof in this matter and have to persuade me that your testimony is more credible than that of the respondent to the extent that there's a disagreement about what happened . . . I feel like I'm not getting the whole story, and that makes it hard for me to say that we need to have an [OFP] when I feel like I'm not getting the whole story.

You know . . . it's hard for me to sort out whether that was credible evidence of domestic abuse that would lead to an [OFP] . . . given my concerns about the credibility about some of what's been testified to, I am going to be denying the petition and vacating the ex parte [OFP].

The district court issued a written order consistent with its ruling. The district court found that mother omitted important details and that neither of the parties were "entirely credible narrators." The court determined that mother failed to meet her "burden of establishing that domestic abuse occurred and an OFP is appropriate." Mother appeals.

DECISION

Mother challenges the order dismissing her petition for an OFP. A district court may issue an OFP to grant relief to a victim of domestic abuse. Minn. Stat. § 518B.01, subd. 4 (2024). The statute defines domestic abuse, in part, to include “(1) physical harm, bodily injury, or assault; (2) the infliction of fear of imminent physical harm, bodily injury, or assault; or (3) terroristic threats” when “committed against a family or household member by a family or household member.” *Id.*, subd. 2(a) (2024). The party seeking the OFP bears the burden to prove that the named respondent committed domestic abuse “against the petitioner or the person on whose behalf the petition is brought.” *Schmidt ex rel. P.M.S. v. Coons*, 818 N.W.2d 523, 527 (Minn. 2012).

We review a district court’s decision to deny an OFP for an abuse of discretion. *Thompson v. Schrimsher*, 906 N.W.2d 495, 500 (Minn. 2018). We must view the record in the light most favorable to the district court’s findings, *Pechovnik v. Pechovnik*, 765 N.W.2d 94, 99 (Minn. App. 2009), and we will not reconcile conflicting evidence or weigh witness credibility, *Aljubailah v. James*, 903 N.W.2d 638, 643 (Minn. App. 2017).

Mother argues that she met her burden to establish domestic abuse by testifying about three separate incidents: (1) when father allegedly put mother in a chokehold;¹

¹ Mother cites three nonprecedential cases that she contends are persuasive authority in support of her argument related to the alleged chokehold incident. But in each case that mother cites, the district court issued an OFP because it found the petitioner credible. *See Hall v Jurek*, No. A19-1607, 2020 WL 4932837 (Minn. App. Aug. 24, 2020); *Brown v. Brown*, No. A10-2086, 2011 WL 2304160 (Minn. App. June 13, 2011); *Pavel v. Pavel*, No. A15-1937, 2016 WL 4162801 (Minn. App. Aug. 8, 2016). Here, the district court did not find mother credible.

(2) when father allegedly kicked down the front door;² and (3) when father allegedly threatened to kill mother. Mother contends that the district court could only logically conclude from her allegations that father committed domestic abuse on multiple occasions.

But the record shows that the district court considered the testimony of both mother and father and did not find either witness to be entirely credible. We defer to a district court's credibility determinations. *Aljubailah*, 903 N.W.2d at 644. Since the district court did not find mother credible, the court appropriately determined that mother did not meet her burden to prove that it was more likely than not that domestic abuse occurred. *See Schmidt*, 818 N.W.2d at 527 (articulating burden of proof). We discern no abuse of discretion in the district court's order dismissing mother's petition for an OFP.

Affirmed.

² Mother argues that the district court erred in ruling on the alleged door incident by improperly reading "an element of intent into the statute that is not there." Mother challenges the district court's ruling that father's "actions were likely inappropriate actions of anger but not intended to frighten [mother]." We need not resolve this question because we determine that the district court denied mother's petition based upon credibility findings that resulted in mother failing to meet the necessary burden of proof.