

BRADLEY S. REED

v.

BETH L. REED

Submitted on Briefs December 30, 2024
Decided January 7, 2025

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Beth L. Reed appeals from the November 30, 2023, judgment of the District Court, (Lewiston, *Malia, J.*) on Bradley S. Reed’s complaint for divorce, which was amended by the March 22, 2024, orders on the parties’ post-judgment motions. Beth¹ argues that the court erred by not finding that Bradley engaged in economic misconduct and that by failing to consider his economic misconduct the court abused its discretion in dividing the marital estate. Contrary to Beth’s contention, we discern no error. *See Peters v. Peters*, 1997 ME 134, ¶ 26, 697 A.2d 1254 (determining that the trial court did not err in finding no economic misconduct where the record supported the property was not transferred for the purpose of diminishing the marital estate); *Thumith v. Thumith*, 2013 ME 67, ¶ 12 n.1, 70 A.3d 1232 (explaining “[b]ecause the court did not err in finding that neither party engaged in economic misconduct, there is no merit to [appellant]’s related contention that the court erred in its division of property and debt by not considering [appellee]’s economic conduct prior to the divorce”).

¹ First names are used because the parties share the same surname.

Further, contrary to Beth's assertions, the court did not abuse its discretion by denying her request for retroactive child support and spousal support, *see Buck v. Buck*, 2015 ME 33, ¶ 8, 113 A.3d 1095, or in its award of attorney fees, *see Largay v. Largay*, 2000 ME 108, ¶¶ 16-17, 752 A.2d 194.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Verne E. Paradie, Jr., Esq., Paradie & Rabasco, P.A., Lewiston, for appellant Beth L. Reed

Elliott L. Epstein, Esq., Shukie & Segovias, Lewiston, for appellee Bradley S. Reed

Lewiston District Court docket numbers FM-2022-469 and FM-2022-471
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY