

WILLIAM C. RAWSTRON

v.

CODY M. RAWSTRON

Submitted on Briefs February 20, 2019
Decided February 28, 2019

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Cody M. Rawstron appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Biddeford, *Tice, J.*) denying her motion to modify a parental rights and responsibilities order in a way that would change the schedule of contact that William C. Rawstron has with the parties' children.¹ We affirm the judgment.

Because Cody bore the burden of proof at the hearing, she must demonstrate on this appeal that the evidence compelled the court to determine that, since the last order determining the parties' parental rights and responsibilities, there has been a change of circumstances with a sufficiently substantial effect on the children's best interests to justify a modification of that prior order and that the requested modification would be in the children's best interests. *See Philbrick v. Cummings*, 534 A.2d 1307, 1308 (Me. 1987); *see also Blanchard v. Blanchard*, 2016 ME 140, ¶ 18, 148 A.3d 277 ("When the party with the burden of proof appeals from a judgment, the appellant must show that the evidence compels a contrary finding." (quotation marks omitted)). Contrary to

¹ The court also denied the portion of Cody's motion requesting a modification of the previous child support order. On this appeal, Cody does not challenge that portion of the judgment.

Cody's contentions, the evidence did not compel the court to make the findings and conclusions necessary for a modification of the most recent prior order, which was issued in June of 2016.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Cody M. Rawstron, pro se, and Rita M. Farry, Esq., Desmond & Rand, PA,
Westbrook, for appellant Cody M. Rawstron

William C. Rawstron, appellee pro se

Biddeford District Court docket number FM-2014-118
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY