

THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SUPREME COURT

In Case No. 2015-0231, In the Matter of Michele Mayo and Dana Mayo, the court on January 13, 2016, issued the following order:

Having considered the briefs and record submitted on appeal, we conclude that oral argument is unnecessary in this case. See Sup. Ct. R. 18(1). We affirm.

The respondent, Dana Mayo (husband), appeals a final order by the Circuit Court (Carroll, J.) in his divorce from the petitioner, Michele Mayo (wife), awarding the wife alimony of \$65 a week for approximately seventeen years. See RSA 458:19 (Supp. 2016); Henry v. Henry, 129 N.H. 159, 162 (1987) (holding rehabilitative principle of alimony not controlling when supported spouse suffers from ill health and is not capable of earning income). We construe his brief to contend that the trial court erred by finding that: (1) the wife was in need of alimony; (2) he had the ability to pay alimony while meeting his own reasonable needs; and (3) he owed \$2,839 in temporary alimony arrearage.

The appealing party, here the husband, has the burden to provide this court with a record sufficient to decide his issues on appeal. See Bean v. Red Oak Prop. Mgmt., 151 N.H. 248, 250 (2004); see also Sup. Ct. R. 13. In this case, the husband has not provided this court with his motion filed in the trial court to reconsider its order on the wife's request for temporary alimony, or his motion to reconsider the trial court's final order. Nor has he provided the trial court's order on the first of these motions. Furthermore, his arguments are minimally developed. See State v. Blackmer, 149 N.H. 47, 49 (2003) (stating mere laundry list of complaints regarding trial court's rulings, without developed legal argument, is insufficient to warrant judicial review). Accordingly, we affirm the trial court.

Affirmed.

Dalianis, C.J., and Hicks, Conboy, Lynn, and Bassett, JJ., concurred.

**Eileen Fox,
Clerk**