

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

JACKQUELINE E. PAPADIS, n.k.a. JACKQUELINE TANNREUTHER, ¹	:	APPEAL NO. C-160469 TRIAL NO. P-06-2877Z
Plaintiff-Appellant,	:	
vs.	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
RANDALL B. REYNOLDS,	:	
Defendant-Appellee.	:	

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.

Jackqueline Tannreuther appeals from the judgment of the Hamilton County Juvenile Court ordering Randall B. Reynolds to pay child support in the amount of \$510 (including the processing fee) retroactive to August 4, 2015, for R.R., the child of Tannreuther and Reynolds.

In her sole assignment of error, Tannreuther argues that the trial court erred by rejecting the magistrate’s recommendation that the order of support be retroactive to November 12, 2014. On that date, Tannreuther had requested that child support be allowed under the parties’ shared-parenting plan when responding to Reynolds’s motion to modify the parenting-time provisions of the plan. The trial court selected an effective

¹ The plaintiff’s first name is denoted as “Jacqueline” on her notice of appeal but not on her original complaint.

date of August 4, 2015, when the parties' agreement to modify the shared-parenting plan to require Reynolds to pay support was documented in an agreed temporary order.

The trial court has broad discretion in determining whether and to what date to make a child-support order retroactive. *See Booth v. Booth*, 44 Ohio St.3d 142, 144, 541 N.E.2d 1028 (1989); *Lassiter v. Lassiter*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-010309, 2002-Ohio-3136, ¶ 7. Although it is common to award retroactive support to the date upon which the obligee first asked for the commencement or modification of support, the trial court selected a date that related to the parties' agreement to modify the support term of the shared-parenting plan, and noted that there had been no evidence of a purposeful delay by the obligor to avoid a retroactive support obligation in this case. Upon review of the record, we cannot say that the trial court's decision in this case was unreasonable, arbitrary or unconscionable so as to connote an abuse of discretion. *See Lassiter* at ¶ 7, citing *Blakemore v. Blakemore*, 5 Ohio St.3d 217, 218, 450 N.E.2d 1140 (1983). Accordingly, we overrule the assignment of error.

Therefore, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

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

CUNNINGHAM, P.J., ZAYAS and MYERS, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on May 3, 2017
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge