

MICHAEL R. KNOWLTON

v.

VICTORIA M. RIVERS

Submitted on Briefs June 21, 2023
Decided June 29, 2023

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Victoria M. Rivers and Michael R. Knowlton each appeal from a judgment entered in the District Court (Lewiston, *Churchill, J.*) modifying the parties' parental rights and responsibilities with respect to their child. The judgment, inter alia, awarded Rivers primary residence of the parties' child and modified Knowlton's contact rights with the child. Contrary to Knowlton's arguments, the court did not clearly err in its factual findings. See *Jackson v. MacLeod*, 2014 ME 110, ¶¶ 9-10, 100 A.3d 484; *Sulikowski v. Sulikowski*, 2019 ME 143, ¶ 9, 216 A.3d 893; cf. *Francoeur v. Berube*, 2023 ME 27, ¶¶ 13-16, 293 A.3d 418.

Nor did the court abuse its discretion in awarding Rivers primary residence or in its allocation of contact rights to Knowlton. See 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(3) (2023); *Francoeur*, 2023 ME 27, ¶ 11, 293 A.3d 418; *Jackson*, 2014 ME 110, ¶ 23, 100 A.3d 484 (explaining that "[a] trial court is afforded broad discretion to determine the custodial arrangements for a minor child, and the determination of the weight to be given to each factor, see 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(3), is left to the sound discretion of the trial court after careful

consideration” (quotation marks and alteration omitted)); *Bulkley v. Bulkley*, 2013 ME 101, ¶¶ 11, 13-14, 82 A.3d 116.¹

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Victoria M. Rivers, appellant pro se

E. Chris L’Hommedieu, Esq., L’Hommedieu Law Office, PA, Lewiston, for cross-appellant Michael R. Knowlton

Lewiston District Court docket number FM-2019-532
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

¹ We reject Knowlton’s contention that the court failed to sufficiently elaborate on its reasoning regarding the factors in 19-A M.R.S. § 1653(3) (2023) and how the court weighed those factors. See *Sulikowski v. Sulikowski*, 2019 ME 143, ¶ 11, 216 A.3d 893; *Dalton v. Dalton*, 2014 ME 108, ¶¶ 21-22, 99 A.3d 723. We do not reach Rivers’s remaining arguments because they involve evidence and arguments that were not presented to the court. See M.R. App. P. 5(a); Alexander, *Maine Appellate Practice* § 402(a) at 238 (6th ed. 2022).