

Simultaneous with the filing of exceptions, Plaintiff also filed a praecipe for an alimony hearing.¹ At argument, however, Plaintiff's counsel stated that there is no need for a Master's Hearing. She argued that *alimony pendente lite* should be awarded from the date of the petition through today's date. It is noted that Defendant filed his affidavit of consent, as well as a waiver of notice, on December 3, 2012. Plaintiff has not yet filed her consent. She has not engaged in any litigation nor does she plan to. The hearing officer was correct in finding no need for *apl*. The court believes that to award *apl* as requested by Plaintiff's counsel would be to simply reward her for her dilatory tactics. This the court will not do.

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of January 2013, for the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's exceptions are hereby denied. The Order of October 24, 2012, is hereby affirmed.

BY THE COURT,

Dudley N. Anderson, Judge

cc: Family Court
Domestic Relations Section
Patricia Bowman, Esq.
Meghan Young, Esq.
Gary Weber, Esq.
Hon. Dudley Anderson

¹ According to the family court scheduling clerk, at the instruction of the hearing officer, that hearing has not yet been scheduled pending decision on the instant exceptions. In light of counsel's statement that there is no need for a Master's Hearing, Family Court is hereby instructed to **not** schedule the hearing.