

KEVIN M. HEALY

v.

SYLVIA M. HEALY-KNOX

Submitted on Briefs November 28, 2012

Decided December 13, 2012

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and ALEXANDER, LEVY, MEAD, GORMAN, and JABAR, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Sylvia Healy-Knox appeals from a judgment in the District Court (York, *Janelle, J.*) denying her motions for contempt and modification of spousal and child support orders. Sylvia's contempt motion sought to enforce an award of attorney fees to her former attorney. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 952(1)(D) (2011) (authorizing the court to award attorney fees). The court did not err in denying Sylvia's motion because, as the court noted in its judgment, there was no evidence presented at trial and there is no evidence in the record that the attorney fees have not been paid.

Additionally, contrary to Sylvia's contentions, the court did not abuse its discretion in denying her motions to modify her payment of child support and receipt of spousal support. When we review the appeal of a motion denied "and a trial court does not state its reasons for denying its motion, a court on appeal may affirm the denial *for any apparent reason that is supported by the record.*" Alexander, *Maine Appellate Practice* § 426 at 238 (3d ed. 2008) (emphasis added). The court did not abuse its discretion in denying the motion because Sylvia did not present evidence of a substantial change in circumstances warranting a modification of the existing support orders awarded in the parties' divorce

proceedings. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 2009(3) (requiring a substantial change in circumstances to modify child support when it has been less than three years since the initial child support order); *Jabar v. Jabar*, 2006 ME 74, ¶ 13, 899 A.2d 796; *see also Petinelli v. Yost*, 2007 ME 121, ¶ 14, 930 A.2d 1074 (requiring a substantial change in circumstances to modify spousal support).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

On the briefs:

Sylvia M. Healy-Knox, appellant pro se

Gregory J. Orso, Esq., Orso Law, P.A., York, for appellee
Kevin Healy