

RAYMOND S. PATTERSON

v.

ANDREA RODRIGUE

Submitted on Briefs February 24, 2021  
Decided March 4, 2021

Panel: GORMAN, JABAR, HUMPHREY, HORTON, and CONNORS, JJ.

#### MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Raymond S. Patterson appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Lewiston, *Lawrence, D.C.J.*) denying his motion to modify his spousal support obligation, pursuant to 19-A M.R.S. § 951-A(4) (2020), and for relief from judgment, pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 60(b). Contrary to Patterson's contentions, the trial court did not clearly err in its factual findings when it did not find portions of his testimony credible, *Quirk v. Quirk*, 2020 ME 132, ¶ 15, 241 A.3d 851, and when it found that a payment he was required to make to Andrea Rodrigue as part of the marital property distribution was not conditioned on his receipt of a bonus. The court applied the correct law when it found that he failed to establish a substantial change in Rodrigue's circumstances justifying a modification in his support obligations, *Pettinelli v. Yost*, 2007 ME 121, ¶ 11, 930 A.2d 1074, and the court's choices were within the bounds of reasonableness in light of the earning capacities of the parties. *Voter v. Voter*, 2015 ME 11, ¶¶ 21-22, 109 A.3d 626. Finally, the court did not abuse its discretion when it denied Patterson's Rule 60(b) motion regarding the property distribution payment because he failed to establish any reason justifying relief. *Haskell v. Haskell*, 2017 ME 91, ¶ 12, 160 A.3d 1176.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Daniel A. Wentworth, Esq., Law Offices of Dylan Boyd, Portland, for appellant  
Raymond S. Patterson

Sarah C. Mitchell, Esq., and Amy Dieterich, Esq., Skelton Taintor & Abbott,  
Auburn, for appellee Andrea Rodrigue

Lewiston District Court Docket Number FM-2017-85  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY