Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

APPELLANT *PRO SE*:

MICHAEL A. DAVIS
New Castle, Indiana

ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEES:

GREGORY F. ZOELLER
Attorney General of Indiana

FRANCES BARROW
Deputy Attorney General
Indianapolis, Indiana

IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

IN RE: THE PATERNITY OF G.R.	)	
	)	
M.D.,	)	
	)	
Appellant-Petitioner,	)	
	)	
vs.	)	No. 33A04-0812-JV-730
	)	
STATE OF INDIANA and T.R.,	)	
	)	
Appellees-Respondents.	)	

APPEAL FROM THE HENRY SUPERIOR COURT
The Honorable Michael D. Peyton, Judge
The Honorable Lyn W. O'Neal, Probate Commissioner
Cause No. 33D01-9303-JP-13

May 19, 2009

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

BRADFORD, Judge

On appeal, Appellant-Petitioner M.D. challenges the trial court's determination relating to his child support arrearage. We affirm.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

G.R. was born to T.R. on April 20, 1990. On July 28, 1994, M.D. was determined to be the father of G.R. and was ordered by the trial court to pay $20.00 per week for the support and maintenance of G.R. retroactively commencing March 23, 1993. M.D. was also ordered to reimburse the Indiana State Department of Welfare for the cost of a blood grouping test in the amount of $285.00.

On March 3, 2006, the trial court issued an order in which M.D.'s child support arrearages were adjudicated to be $3558.00 to the State of Indiana, $9724.00 to T.R., and $235.00 for testing. M.D. did not file a direct appeal of the trial court's March 3, 2006 order. On May 27, 2008, M.D. filed a Verified Petition to Reduce Child Support challenging the trial court's March 3, 2006 arrearage determination and alleging that G.R. was emancipated as of April 20, 2008. On December 4, 2008, the trial court denied M.D.'s request to re-evaluate the March 3, 2006 arrearage determination and ordered that G.R. should be emancipated as of April 20, 2008. M.D. now appeals.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

Generally, decisions regarding child support rest within the sound discretion of the trial court. *Dore v. Dore*, 782 N.E.2d 1015, 1018 (Ind. Ct. App. 2003). We will reverse a trial court's decision in child support matters only for an abuse of discretion if the trial court's determination is contrary to law. *Id*.

M.D. claims that the trial court's March 3, 2006 child support arrearage determination was incorrect in that it failed to credit him with certain monies paid to the State of Indiana and T.R. The State, on the other hand, claims that M.D. has waived any challenge to the trial court's March 3, 2006 arrearage determination because he failed to appeal from the original order. We agree with the State.

The record establishes that the trial court issued an order on March 3, 2006, adjudicating M.D.'s child support arrearages to be $3558.00 to the State of Indiana, $9724.00 to T.R., and $235 for testing. M.D. did not appeal this order. Timely action after a trial court's final judgment is a jurisdictional prerequisite, and failure to conform with the applicable time limits results in forfeiture on appeal. *Hatfield v. Edward J. DeBartolo Corp.*, 676 N.E.2d 395, 398 (Ind. Ct. App. 1997), *trans. denied*. M.D. has waived his right to appeal the trial court's arrearage determination because he failed to appeal from the trial court's original March 3, 2006 order. *See also Holman v. Holman*, 472 N.E.2d 1279, 1287 n.9 (Ind. Ct. App. 1985) (concluding that husband waived any error in the trial court's order that he pay the cost of his daughter's parochial school education because he failed to appeal from the original decree).

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

CRONE, J. and BROWN, J., concur.