

## OPINION SUMMARY

### MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS EASTERN DISTRICT

#### DIVISION ONE

PHILLIP R. SULLINS,	)	No. ED99569
	)	
Appellant,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court
	)	of St. Louis County
vs.	)	
	)	Honorable Douglas R. Beach
SNOW C. SULLINS,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	FILED: January 21, 2014

Phillip R. Sullins ("Husband") appeals from the trial court's "Judgment/Order and Decree of Dissolution" ("Judgment") between him and Snow C. Sullins ("Wife"), *inter alia*, awarding Wife maintenance, child support, and Wife's attorney's fees.

AFFIRM IN PART; REVERSE AND REMAND IN PART.

Division One Holds: The trial court is required to calculate the presumed child support amount pursuant to Civil Procedure Form 14 ("Form 14"). Thorp v. Thorp, 390 S.W.3d 871, 882 (Mo. App. E.D. 2013). The Form 14 contained in the Legal File here is mostly blank. Without a proper Form 14 completed to demonstrate the presumed child support amount, we are left without explanation as to how that computation was made and a proper review is unattainable. Granting Husband's first point, we reverse and remand the case to the trial court for judicial proceedings necessary for the resolution of the presumed correct child support amount and the mandatory Form 14 to be included in the record. The trial court is directed to make its findings consistent within its judgment. We remind the trial court to give credit to Husband for his child support obligation in determining the presumed correct child support amount on remand.

Additionally, we affirm the maintenance award here. The evidence, viewed in the light most favorable to the Judgment, demonstrates that the trial court considered all relevant factors when it determined a maintenance award for Wife, including Social Security income. Finally, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in awarding modifiable maintenance because there was no substantial evidence on the record of an impending change in the financial conditions of the parties.

Opinion by: Roy L. Richter, P.J.  
Clifford H. Ahrens, J., and Glenn A. Norton, J., concur.

Attorneys for Appellant: Lee R. Elliott  
Attorneys for Respondent: Marie Amdenola Kenyon

**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**