

NOT DESIGNATED FOR PUBLICATION

No. 102,107

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

IN THE MATTER OF
KIMBRA (PHILLIPS) MARTIN,
Appellee,

and

DANIEL PHILLIPS,
Appellant.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Appeal from Johnson District Court; ALLEN R. SLATER, judge. Opinion filed September 17, 2010. Affirmed.

Daniel D. Phillips, appellant pro se.

Kimbra Martin, appellee pro se.

Before MALONE, P.J., PIERRON, J., and BUKATY, S.J.

Per Curiam: Daniel Phillips appeals the district court's determination that a Washington state child support enforcement order in favor of Kimbra (Phillips) Martin may be registered in Kansas under the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA). Finding no error, we affirm the district court's decision.

The parties are familiar with the long and tortuous history of this case, so we will not set forth the facts in detail. Phillips and Martin were divorced on June 30, 1989. The child for whom Phillips was ordered to pay support is now an adult. On July 18, 2008,

Martin filed a notice of registration of support order from the Superior Court of Washington, King County, in the Johnson County district court under UIFSA. After the August 19, 2008, trial, the district court determined that Phillips could not collaterally attack the Washington judgment in Kansas courts. The district court ruled that the Washington enforcement order was properly registered in Johnson County pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,601 and 602.

Furthermore, the district court ruled that Phillips failed to prove one or more of the defenses against the registration of the Washington enforcement order pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(1)-(7). Specifically, the district court found: (1) the court had personal jurisdiction over Phillips pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(1); (2) the enforcement order was not obtained through fraud pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(2); (3) the enforcement order was not vacated, suspended, or modified by a later order except Exhibits 203 and 204 pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(3); (4) there was no stay in any of the legal proceedings pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(4); (5) Phillips did not prove there was a defense to Martin's registration of the enforcement order through a violation of his right to due process of law, the satisfaction of restitution in Phillips' criminal case, or through accord and satisfaction pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(5); (6) there was no accord and satisfaction or payment and release of the back child support pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(6); and (7) the statute of limitations had not run to bar Martin's registration of the Washington enforcement order pursuant to K.S.A. 23-9,607(a)(7).

In addition, the district court determined that under K.S.A. 23-9,601, the enforcement order issued by Washington could be registered in Kansas despite the fact that Kansas was the issuing tribunal of the original child support order. The total judgment awarded to Martin through August 18, 2008, was \$66,267.38. In addition, the district court granted several of Martin's requests for attorney fees, but not all of them. Phillips timely appealed the district court's judgment.

Phillips' primary claims on appeal are that the district court erred in determining that the Washington enforcement order was properly registered in Kansas and in rejecting his defenses to registration of the order. We note that many of Phillips' arguments in this appeal were already considered and rejected by this court in Phillips' prior appeal where this court determined that the Johnson County District Court did not err in granting full faith and credit to a Washington state court's calculations of Phillips' arrearages in child support payments. *In re Marriage of Phillips*, No. 91,917, unpublished opinion filed February 25, 2005.

We have thoroughly reviewed the briefs submitted by the parties and record on appeal. We also have reviewed the district court's comprehensive journal entry of judgment addressing all the issues raised by Phillips. We conclude the district court committed no error in its analysis of the law, and the district court's written decision adequately explains the reasons for its ruling. Accordingly, we affirm the district court's judgment that the Washington enforcement order was properly registered in Johnson County.

Affirmed pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 7.042(b) and (e) (2009 Kan. Ct. R. Annot. 58).