

**MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT**

**CHRISTOPHER L. JONES,
RESPONDENT**

vs.

**ANGELA C. JONES,
APPELLANT**

WD69213

DATE: FEBRUARY 10, 2009

Appeal from:
CLAY COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT
THE HONORABLE KATHRYN E. DAVIS, JUDGE

Appellate Judges:
Division Three: Howard, P.J., Ellis and Ahuja, JJ.

Attorneys:
James A. Kessinger, Esq., Kansas City, MO., for Appellant

Matt Chiasson, Esq., Kansas City, MO, for Respondent

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

COURT OF APPEALS, WESTERN DISTRICT

CHRISTOPHER L. JONES,
v.
ANGELA C. JONES,

Appellant

Respondent

WD 69213

Clay County, Missouri

Before Division Two Judges: Howard, P.J., Ellis and Ahuja, JJ.

Christopher Jones appeals from a judgment dissolving his marriage to Angela Jones and awarding joint legal and physical custody of their two minor children.

Remanded in part, affirmed in part, and reversed and remanded in part.

Division Three holds:

- I. The trial court erred in failing to issue statutorily required findings for the relevant best interest factors under § 452.375 before designating Mother's address as the children's for educational and mailing purposes, thereby precluding meaningful appellate review.
- II. The trial court erred in failing to order the parties to split the income tax dependency deductions because both parties concede that they agreed to split the deductions.
- III. The trial court's valuation of the marital residence was not an abuse of discretion because, although neither party testified to the exact value adopted by the court, the value was within the range of evidence.
- IV. The trial court erred in failing to consider the debts accumulated after the parties separated when distributing the marital assets and debts and calculating an equalization payment because debts accumulated after separation are still marital debts and must be considered when determining a fair and just division of marital assets and debts. Because this portion of the judgment is reversed and remanded, it is

unnecessary to address whether the timing of the equalization was an abuse of discretion.

Opinion by Joseph M. Ellis, Judge February 10, 2009

This summary is UNOFFICIAL and should not be quoted or cited.