

ROBERT G. LaFLAMME

v.

ANGELA K. (LaFLAMME) LYONS

Argued February 9, 2016
Decided March 8, 2016

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Robert G. LaFlamme appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Biddeford, *Janelle, J.*) denying his post-judgment motion to modify his spousal and child support obligations and granting Angela K. (LaFlamme) Lyons's motion for contempt. The hearing record indicates that, except for payments garnished by the Department of Health and Human Services, LaFlamme had substantially disregarded the child and spousal support obligations, as well as a number of other obligations, imposed by the parties' divorce judgment.

On the day of the hearing on the post-judgment motions, LaFlamme submitted a draft proposed order addressing the motions. After the hearing, Lyons submitted her own proposed order. After considering the evidence and the parties' arguments, the court made some changes to the payment deadlines in Lyons's draft order and signed that order as the order of the court.

Contrary to LaFlamme's arguments, our review of the record and the court's judgment indicates that the court adequately performed its judicial function in amending and then adopting Lyons's proposed order, *see In re C.P.*, 2016 ME 18, ¶¶ 17-18, --- A.3d ---; *Jarvis v. Jarvis*, 2003 ME 53, ¶¶ 14-15, 832 A.2d 775;

In re Marpheen C., 2002 ME 170, ¶ 7, 812 A.2d 972 (although “verbatim adoption of findings proposed by one party in a case is disfavored, . . . fact-finding can be aided by parties submitting and trial courts considering and utilizing, where appropriate, draft findings of fact offered by either side. The key question is whether the court findings reflect the application of judgment by the court, and not simply one of the parties”).

Addressing LaFlamme’s other arguments, the record demonstrates that the court did not err or abuse its discretion in finding that there had not been a substantial change in circumstances as to the parties’ financial situations since their divorce, *see Pettinelli v. Yost*, 2007 ME 121, ¶¶ 14-15, 930 A.2d 1074, and did not err or abuse its discretion in finding LaFlamme in contempt, *see Beckerman v. Pooler*, 2015 ME 80, ¶ 7, 119 A.3d 74.¹

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

On the briefs and at oral argument:

Elyse B. Segovias, Esq., Andrucki & King, Lewiston, for
appellant Robert G. LaFlamme

Madeline K. Malisa, Esq., Douglas, Denham, Buccina & Ernst,
Portland, for appellee Angela K. Lyons

Biddeford District Court docket number FM-2011-427
For Clerk Reference Only

¹ After its original judgment, the court corrected an error in the contempt sanction, rendering that aspect of LaFlamme’s claim moot on appeal.