

Regarding this Court's authority to manage the procedural components of its cases generally, and to impose limitations and restrictions where important and necessary, New Hampshire Law is clear: State v. Letendre, 161 N.H. 370, 376 (2011). In imposing the pleading limitations set out below, I have balanced the competing interests of these children, who are entitled to finality; their parents, who are entitled to due process and access to the court; and the rights of other litigants needing access to the same court. In re: Stapleford, 156 N.H. 260 (2007) and In re: Martin, 160 N.H. 645, 649 (2010). The limits imposed took into consideration the history of this file, which I have just reviewed; the gravity of the matters involved; and my experience in gauging the reasonable length of

trial and hearing time in similar matters of this kind. See MCI Communications Corp. and AT&T, 708 F.2d 1081, 1171 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1983); US v. Raddatz, 447 U.S. 666, 677 (1997); In re: Marriage of Vidal, 210 WL 33 249 39; U.S. v. Hillebrand, 928 F. Sup. 841 (N.D. Iowa 1996), and In re: Estate of King, N. 2006-0950, slip opinion at page 1 (New Hampshire May 10, 2007).