

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

VANESSA ROBINSON,	:	APPEAL NO. C-160217
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	TRIAL NO. P05-523Z
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
JARRELL PALMER,	:	
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* Rep.Op.R. 3.1; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Defendant-appellant Jarrell Palmer appeals pro se from the judgment of the Hamilton County Juvenile Court modifying his child-support obligation for his son.

In his first assignment of error, Palmer argues that “the juvenile court erred when it failed to make part of its judgment entry the applicable child support guideline worksheets” in accordance with *Marker v. Grimm*, 65 Ohio St.3d 139, 601 N.E.2d 496 (1992), paragraph one of the syllabus. In his second assignment of error, Palmer argues the juvenile court’s decision to modify his child-support obligation is against the manifest weight of the evidence because the juvenile court “failed to compute a new child support worksheet and instead adopted the exact same figures

presented by [the Hamilton County Child Support Enforcement Agency] CSEA which is inappropriate and not in the best interests of the child.”

Palmer’s arguments are not supported by the record. When the magistrate ruled on Palmer’s motion to modify his child-support obligation, she did not rely on the worksheet CSEA had used to previously modify Palmer’s child-support obligation to \$303.49 a month. Instead, she completed a new child-support worksheet, when modifying Palmer’s child support to \$262.66 per month. When the juvenile court overruled Palmer’s objections, it adopted the magistrate’s decision, which had incorporated this child-support worksheet. *See Wuscher v. Wuscher*, 9th Dist. Summit No. 27697, 2015-Ohio-5377, ¶ 22-24 (holding that a trial court’s adoption of a magistrate’s decision incorporating a completed child-support-guideline worksheet complies with the mandate of *Marker v. Grimm*). We, therefore, overrule Palmer’s first and second assignments of error and affirm the judgment of the juvenile court.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall constitute the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

FISCHER, P.J., CUNNINGHAM and MOCK, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on October 14, 2016

per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge