**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.**

FILED
May 25 2011, 9:54 am
CLERK
of the supreme court, court of appeals and tax court

APPELLANT *PRO SE*:

**JOSEPH N. WRIGHT**
Flossmoor, Illinois

# IN THE
# COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| JOSEPH N. WRIGHT, | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Appellant-Petitioner, | ) | |
| | ) | |
| vs. | ) | No. 45A03-1010-DR-556 |
| | ) | |
| AQUAVALYN S. WRIGHT, | ) | |
| | ) | |
| Appellee-Respondent. | ) | |

APPEAL FROM THE LAKE SUPERIOR COURT
The Honorable Elizabeth F. Tavitas, Judge
The Honorable Nanette K. Raduenz, Magistrate
Cause No. 45D03-0612-DR-1317

**May 25, 2011**

**MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**BRADFORD, Judge**

In this pro se appeal, Appellant-Petitioner Joseph Wright challenges the trial court's denial of his petition for modification of child support. We affirm.

## FACTS[1]

Wright's marriage to Aquavalyn Wright was dissolved in December 2007. Three children were born to the marriage. Pursuant to the dissolution decree, Wright was ordered to pay child support in the amount of $177.06 per week per child. The trial court imputed $50,000 in annual income to Wright when reaching this amount.

On August 31, 2010, Wright petitioned for modification of his support obligation, requesting that the court look to his actual income rather than the imputed amount for purposes of calculating the amount due. Following a hearing, on October 18, 2010, the trial court denied the motion, finding that Wright had failed to show a change in circumstances rendering the existing support order unreasonable. The trial court further observed that Wright's arrearage as of that date was $22,366.61, which the court reduced to a judgment against Wright. This appeal follows.

## DECISION

In reviewing the trial court's decision regarding the modification of child support, we reverse only for an abuse of discretion. *In re Marriage of Kraft*, 868 N.E.2d 1181, 1185 (Ind. Ct. App. 2007). An abuse of discretion occurs when the decision is clearly against the logic and effect of the facts and circumstances before the court, including any reasonable inferences therefrom. *Id*.

[1] Wright's failure to include any record citations, as required by Indiana Appellate Rule 46(A)(6)(a), substantially impedes our review of his case.

Modification of a child support order is governed by Indiana Code section 31-16-8-1 (2010), which provides that child support orders generally may only be modified upon a showing of (1) changed circumstances so substantial and continuing as to make the terms unreasonable; or (2) that a party has been ordered to pay an amount in child support differing by more than twenty percent from the amount which would have been ordered pursuant to the child support guidelines. Subsection (2) supports modification only if the order requested to be modified was issued at least twelve months before the petition seeking modification was filed. *See* Ind. Code § 31-16-8-1(b)(2)(B). The party seeking to modify a child support order bears the burden of establishing that the requirements of section 31-16-8-1 have been met. *See Saalfrank v. Saalfrank*, 899 N.E.2d 671, 675 (Ind. Ct. App. 2008).

As a preliminary matter, Wright has failed to supply this court with a copy of the transcript from the hearing or with citations to relevant parts of the record relied upon as required by Indiana Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a). Without a complete record and corresponding citations thereto, Wright's claims are waived.

Waiver notwithstanding, Wright's claim fails. Wright concedes that the trial court, which observed his "nice jewelry" and "nice clothes," stated, "I do not see any change in your income or circumstances in this case." Appellant's Br. p. 2-3. Wright challenges this finding by relying upon certain child support worksheets, tax returns, and a Veterans Administration document he apparently submitted to the court. The trial court was not required to credit Wright's documents, especially his own representation of income in his child support worksheet. We find no abuse of discretion.

The judgment of the trial court is affirmed.

BAKER, J., and MAY, J., concur.