

DEBORAH (HINDLEY) BECKWITH

v.

WILLIAM HINDLEY

Submitted on Briefs September 26, 2013

Decided October 3, 2013

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

#### MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

William Hindley appeals from a judgment entered in the District Court (West Bath, *Sparaco, J.*) granting his motion to modify spousal support. Contrary to Hindley's contentions, the court adequately identified the type of support awarded as well as the statutory factors it relied upon in making the support award. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 951-A(1) (2012); *Potter v. Potter*, 2007 ME 95, ¶ 8, 926 A.2d 1193 ("Although the court has a duty to make sufficient findings to inform the parties of the reasons for its conclusions, and to allow for effective appellate review, there is no requirement that a court detail the rationale it uses to reach each finding of fact or conclusion of law."). Furthermore, the court did not err and did adequately consider the evidence at trial in determining there was no substantial change in Deborah (Hindley) Beckwith's financial circumstances. *See Ellis v. Ellis*, 2008 ME 191, ¶ 15, 962 A.2d 328 ("We review the trial court's factual finding regarding whether a substantial change in circumstances exists for clear error.").

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

**On the briefs:**

John F. Barnicle, Esq., and Paul J. Brunetti, Esq., Moncure & Barnicle,  
Brunswick, for appellant William Hindley

Justin W. Andrus, Esq., Shankman & Associates, Topsham, for appellee  
Deborah Hindley

West Bath District Court docket number FM-2010-98  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY