

KEVIN F. O’SULLIVAN

v.

KAREN G. (O’SULLIVAN) PELLETIER

Submitted on Briefs January 28, 2016
Decided February 4, 2016

Panel: ALEXANDER, MEAD, GORMAN, JABAR, HJELM, and HUMPHREY
JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Kevin F. O’Sullivan appeals and Karen G. (O’Sullivan) Pelletier cross-appeals from a post-judgment order issued by the District Court (Portland, *L. Walker, J.*). We affirm.

Contrary to O’Sullivan’s contention, the court did not err in its conclusion that the spousal support provisions of the divorce judgment are unambiguous and in its application of those unambiguous provisions while determining O’Sullivan’s liability for unpaid support. *See Ramsdell v. Worden*, 2011 ME 55, ¶¶ 17-19, 17 A.3d 1224. Further, O’Sullivan’s challenges to the court’s calculations of that arrearage fail, because despite the requirements of M.R. App. P. 5(b)(2)(A), the parties failed to include a transcript of the hearing in the record on appeal, and we therefore accept the court’s factual findings and assume that sufficient competent evidence was presented in support of those findings. *See Springer v. Springer*, 2009 ME 118, ¶ 8, 984 A.2d 828. Finally, contrary to Pelletier’s assertion, the reasons stated by the court for its rejection of her request for attorney fees do not demonstrate an abuse of discretion. *See* 19-A M.R.S. § 105(1) (2015); *Jandreau v. LaChance*, 2015 ME 66, ¶ 29, 116 A.3d 1273; *Ellis v. Ellis*, 2008 ME 191, ¶ 26, 962 A.2d 328.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

On the briefs:

Dori F. Chadbourne, Esq., Chadbourne Law Offices, P.A.,
Portland, for appellant Kevin F. O'Sullivan

Karen G. (O'Sullivan) Pelletier, appellee pro se