

MICHELLE L. SEYMOUR

v.

JOSHUA J. SEYMOUR

Submitted on Briefs December 28, 2022
Decided February 14, 2023

Panel: STANFILL, C.J., and MEAD, JABAR, HORTON, and CONNORS, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Michelle L. Seymour appeals, and Joshua J. Seymour cross-appeals, from an order entered by the District Court (Springvale, *Moskowitz, J.*) modifying a divorce judgment between the parties on remand after a previous appeal to us. *See Seymour v. Seymour*, 2021 ME 60, 263 A.3d 1079. Contrary to Michelle’s contention, the court did not exceed the scope of its authority on remand by ordering, inter alia, that the parties’ children “shall be with each [of them] on alternating weeks.”¹ *See id.* ¶¶ 30-31 (vacating the court’s initial order on Joshua’s motion to modify based on insufficient findings to support a reduction in Joshua’s time with the children); *Jackson v. MacLeod*, 2014 ME 110, ¶ 27, 100 A.3d 484 (“Courts may order modification of parental rights orders based on events that occur after the filing of the motion to modify.”).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

¹ Because we conclude that the court acted within its authority on remand, we need not address Joshua’s alternative contention that the court’s order can be justified as a contempt sanction.

Gregory J. Orso, Esq., Orso Law, P.A., York, for appellant Michelle L. Seymour

Thomas G. Van Houten, Esq., and Jean L. Walsh, Esq., Springvale, for cross-appellant Joshua J. Seymour

Springvale District Court docket number FM-2018-328
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY