

Download In Re Marriage Of Pilant

In re Marriage of Washburn, 101 Wn.2d 168, 179, 677 P.2d 152 (1984); In re Marriage of Glorfield, 27 Wn. App. 358, 360, 617 P.2d 1051, review denied, 94 Wn.2d 1025 (1980). Abuse of discretion does not exist unless it can be held that no reasonable person would have ruled as the trial court did on the facts before it. CASE TITLE: In the Matter of the Marriage of George P. Pilant, Respondent, and Marjorie P. Pilant, Appellant. [1] Divorce and Dissolution - Disposition of Property - Discretion of Court - Review. The disposition of property when a marriage is dissolved is a discretionary determination for the trial court. Even if the trial court erroneously valued these small liabilities assumed by Judith, this de minimis error does not require reversal of an otherwise fair and equitable distribution of a marital estate worth over \$600,000. In re Marriage of Pilant, 42 Wn.App. 173, 181, 709 P.2d 1241 (1985). II See In re Marriage of Pilant, 42 Wash.App. 173, 176, 709 P.2d 1241 (1985) (“Abuse of discretion does not exist unless it can be held that no reasonable person would have ruled as the trial court did on the facts before it.”), In Re Marriage Of Pilant.

Other Files :