

STEVEN FERLAND

v.

AMI CONROY

Submitted on Briefs May 19, 2021  
Decided May 27, 2021

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

#### MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Ami Conroy appeals from a judgment entered in the District Court (Bridgton, *S. Driscoll, J.*) modifying a judgment of parental rights and responsibilities regarding her two children with Steven Ferland. Because Conroy did not file a motion for further findings of fact pursuant to M.R. Civ. P. 52(b), we “must assume the trial court made all findings necessary to support its judgment . . . to the extent that those findings are supported by competent record evidence.” *McLeod v. Macul*, 2016 ME 76, ¶ 9, 139 A.3d 920 (quotation marks omitted). Applying this standard to all findings and reviewing the court’s discretionary determinations for an abuse of discretion, the court did not err or abuse its discretion in (1) determining that there had been a substantial change in circumstances justifying modification, *see Aranovitch v. Versel*, 2015 ME 146, ¶¶ 12-13, 15, 127 A.3d 542; (2) determining the schedule of contact based on the children’s best interests, *see* 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(3)(A), (B), (C), (N) (2021); *Dube v. Dube*, 2016 ME 15, ¶ 5, 131 A.3d 381; (3) calculating Ferland’s gross income for child support purposes, *see McLean v. Robertson*, 2020 ME 15, ¶ 10, 225 A.3d 410; *Sulikowski v. Sulikowski*, 2019 ME 143, ¶ 14, 216 A.3d 893; and (4) determining the allocation of dependent tax exemptions, *see Bojarski v. Bojarski*, 2012 ME 56, ¶ 25, 41 A.3d 544.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Ami Conroy, appellant pro se

Kim Pittman, Esq., Vincent, Kantz, Pittman & Thompson, LLC, Portland, for  
appellee Steven Ferland

Bridgton District Court docket number FM-2009-82  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY