In the Missouri Court of Appeals
Eastern District

DIVISION FOUR

CANDICE MERRIWEATHER, N/K/A CANDICE SCHUVAL,	)	No. ED109385
Respondent,	)	Appeal from the Circuit Court of St. Louis County
vs.	)	14SL-DR03833-04
NATHON CHACON,	)	Honorable Bruce F. Hilton
Appellant.	)	Filed: December 28, 2021

Michael E. Gardner, P.J., James M. Dowd, J., and Lisa P. Page, J.

Appellant Nathon P. Chacon (Father) appeals the trial court's judgment denying his motion for contempt and requests for modification of custody and attorneys' fees, and granting Respondent Candice Merriweather, N/K/A Candice Schuval 's (Mother) request to relocate with the parties' minor child (Son). On appeal, Father argues (1) that the trial court abused its discretion because it failed to issue written findings addressing Son's best interest as required by section 452.375.2; (2) that the trial court abused its discretion in granting the proposed relocation because Mother failed to prove it was made in good faith and was in Son's best interests as required by section 452.377.10; (3) that the trial court erred in denying Father's motion for contempt based on Mother's alleged disclosure of his confidential psychological evaluation; and (4) that the trial court abused its discretion by denying Father's request for attorneys' fees due to Mother's violation of the notice requirements of section 452.377.

AFFIRMED.

DIVISION IV HOLDS: The trial court did not err because:

(1) the trial court's factual findings as to the relevant factors regarding Son's best interest complied with sections 452.375 and 452.377;
(2) the trial court's determination that the request for relocation was made in good faith was supported by substantial evidence and was not against the weight of the evidence;
(3) the trial court's determination that Father did not establish a credible case for contempt was supported by the record and was not an abuse of discretion; and

(4) the trial court did not abuse its discretion under section 452.377.6 when it denied Father's request for attorney's fees.

Opinion by: James M. Dowd, J.

Michael E. Gardner, P.J., and Lisa P. Page, J. concur.

Attorneys for Appellant: James J. Leightner

Attorneys for Respondent: Susan M. Hais and Elliott I. Goldberger

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.