

OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

DANIEL J. ALABACH, Appellant,) No. ED101983
) Appeal from the Circuit Court of
vs.) St. Louis County
) Honorable Douglas R. Beach
LISA A. ALABACH, Respondent.) Filed: December 15, 2015

Before Sherri B. Sullivan, P.J., Patricia L. Cohen, J., and Kurt S. Odenwald, J.

PER CURIAM.

Daniel Alabach (Husband) appeals the judgment of the Circuit Court of St. Louis County dissolving his marriage to Lisa Alabach (Wife). Husband claims the trial court erred in: (1) awarding maintenance to Wife (Point I); (2) calculating maintenance (Points II and III); (3) awarding Wife a marital interest in the equity of the marital residence (Point IV); calculating Wife's interest in the marital residence (Point V); dividing and calculating the parties' marital interests in a rental property (Points VI – VIII); awarding Wife a marital interest in his life insurance policies (Point IX); dividing and distributing three marital accounts (Point X); and awarding Wife attorneys' fees (Point XI). We reverse and remand as to Husband's Point X. With respect to the remaining points, we affirm the trial court's judgment pursuant to Rule 84.16(b).¹

REVERSED AND REMANDED IN PART.

Division Four Holds: We remand the court's division of E-Trade Account No. 5015 and SEP Account No. 1805 to conform to the parties' stipulation. We affirm the trial court's division of the Tag Group money market account because Husband failed to demonstrate that the trial court abused its discretion in finding that it was marital property.

Attorney for Appellant: Cherlyn M. Crosby
Attorney for Respondent: Christopher Karlen

THIS SUMMARY IS NOT PART OF THE OPINION OF THE COURT. IT HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THE READER AND SHOULD NOT BE QUOTED OR CITED.

¹ We have reviewed Husband's remaining points and find no trial court error. An extended opinion as to those points would have neither precedential nor jurisprudential value. Therefore, Points I – III, VI – IX, and XI are affirmed in accordance with Rule 84.16(b). We have furnished the parties a memorandum setting forth the reasons for our decision.