

IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LYCOMING COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

JENNIFER STIDFOLE, :
Petitioner/Plaintiff :
 :
v. : No. 99-21,310 :
 : PACSES No. 329101504 :
RAYMOND STIDFOLE, : DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION :
Respondent/Defendant :

LANETTA RODGERS, :
Petitioner/Plaintiff :
 :
v. : No. 99-21,310 :
 : PACSES No. 3493105731 :
RAYMOND STIDFOLE, : DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION :
Respondent/Defendant :

ALOMA WILKERSON, :
Petitioner/Plaintiff :
 :
v. : No. 99-21,310 :
 : PACSES No. 940107700 :
RAYMOND STIDFOLE, : DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION :
Respondent/Defendant :

WENDY MANEVAL, :
Petitioner/Plaintiff :
 :
v. : No. 92-21,709 :
 : PACSES No. 891002260 :
RAYMOND STIDFOLE, : DOMESTIC RELATIONS SECTION :
Respondent/Defendant :

OPINION AND ORDER

Before this Honorable Court, is the Respondent/Defendant's March 23, 2006 Exceptions filed to the Family Court Hearing Officer's March 13, 2006 Support Order. The

Respondent/Defendant asserts that the Family Court Hearing Officer erred in three respects.¹ First, the Respondent/Defendant contends that the Master should have terminated his support obligation, as to Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval, on February 8, 2006 (the date Petitioner/Plaintiff Stidfole requested a review of her support) and not March 8, 2006 (the date Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval withdrew her petition for support). The Respondent/Defendant's last two exceptions contend that the Master erred when she failed to account for the seasonal nature of his employment when calculating his support obligation.

The March 9, 2006 Master's hearing in this matter was initiated when Petitioner/Plaintiff Stidfole requested a review of her support; because all of the Petitioner/Plaintiffs' support would be affected by any change in the Respondent/Defendant's existing support obligation, all were required to attend the March 9, 2006 hearing. At the March 9, 2006 Master's hearing, Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval expressed her wish to withdraw her request for child support after the Master requested she provide further evidence of her income; Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval signed a document closing her support case against the Respondent/Defendant on that date. The Master's March 9, 2006 Support Order directed that the Respondent/Defendant's support obligation, as to Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval, terminated as of March 8, 2006 (the date she withdrew her request for support). Instantly, the Respondent/Defendant claims that he should not be responsible for support, as to Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval, after February 8, 2006 (the date Petitioner/Plaintiff Stidfole requested a review of her support); the Court disagrees. The Respondent/Defendant's total support obligation was only under review because

¹ At the May 22, 2006 hearing on this matter, the Respondent/Defendant asked the Court to consider the fact that he is now unemployed when reviewing the Master's Support Order; however, because the province of the Court hearing exceptions to Support Orders issued by the Family Court is restricted to the facts presented to the Master, the Court will refrain from considering the Respondent/Defendant's request as it more appropriately a matter for a modification of support request.

Petitioner/Plaintiff Stidfole's request may have altered the amount he owed to the remaining Petitioner/Plaintiffs; therefore, his support obligation, as to Petitioner/Plaintiff Maneval, continued until she withdrew her request for support on March 8, 2006. Accordingly, the Court AFFIRMS the Master's Support Order's directive that the Respondent/Defendant owes Petitioner/Plaintiff support for February 8, 2006 through March 8, 2006.

Next, the Respondent/Defendant contends that the Master, when calculating his support obligation, failed to account for the seasonal nature of his employment; however, pages 7-9 of the Master's Order speak directly to this issue. That portion of the Master's Order explains the following:

The Respondent/Defendant's net income for April 8, 2005 through January 1, 2006 (based on his 2005 W-2)	\$19,748.44
The Respondent/Defendant's net income for January 1, 2006 through April 1, 2006 will be (based on his testimony)	\$17,638.40
The Respondent/Defendant's 2005 income tax refund	\$3,300.00
Net income for the year beginning on April 8, 2005 and ending April 1, 2006	<u>\$40,686.84</u> (or \$3,390.57/month)

The Master goes on to state that she projected the Respondent/Defendant's 2006 income so that his support obligation could be based on an entire one year period; the Court agrees with the Master's rationale and her resulting support calculation.

ORDER

AND NOW, this _____ day of May 2006, for the reasons set forth above, it is ORDERED and DIRECTED that the Exceptions filed by the Respondent/Defendant to the Family Court's order of March 13, 2006 are DISMISSED and the Officer's Order is AFFIRMED.

By the Court,

Kenneth D. Brown, P.J.

cc: Jennifer Stidfole, 19 Gail Lane, Hughesville, PA 17737
Lanetta Rodgers, 60 Wagner Avenue, Montgomery, PA 17752
Aloma Wilkerson, 130 A E. Water Street, Muncy, PA 17756
Wendy Maneval, 76 Old Road, Montgomery, PA 17752
Michael C. Morrone, Esq.
Family Court
Domestic Relations (SF)
Hon. Kenneth D. Brown
Laura R. Burd, Law Clerk
Gary L. Weber, Esq.