

*This opinion will be unpublished and
may not be cited except as provided by
Minn. Stat. § 480A.08, subd. 3 (2016).*

**STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS
A17-2027**

Marjorie A. Gomes,
Respondent,

vs.

James D. Meyer,
Appellant,

County of Clay, intervenor,
Respondent.

**Filed October 22, 2018
Affirmed
Bjorkman, Judge**

Clay County District Court
File No. 14-FA-12-913

Marjorie A. Gomes, Sabin, Minnesota (pro se respondent)

James D. Meyer, Layton, Utah (pro se appellant)

Brian J. Melton, Clay County Attorney, Jenny M. Samarzja, Assistant County Attorney,
Moorhead, Minnesota (for respondent county)

Considered and decided by Hooten, Presiding Judge; Halbrooks, Judge; and
Bjorkman, Judge.

UNPUBLISHED OPINION

BJORKMAN, Judge

In this appeal following remand, appellant-husband challenges a child-support magistrate's (CSM) application of Georgia law to determine the accrued interest on his spousal-maintenance arrears. We affirm.

FACTS

Appellant James D. Meyer and respondent Marjorie A. Gomes's 21-year marriage was dissolved in 2009 in Georgia. The Georgia court ordered husband to pay wife spousal maintenance in the amount of \$2,500 per month through 2030. During the marriage, husband was the sole provider for wife and their seven children. After wife moved with the children to Minnesota, the Georgia dissolution judgment was registered in Minnesota.

In 2013, husband petitioned to terminate his spousal-maintenance obligation. Upon wife's motion, the district court issued an order to show cause regarding husband's failure to pay maintenance and child support. Respondent Clay County intervened with regard to child support. The district court found that husband was unemployed in 2011 and accumulated total arrears of \$74,657.48 before obtaining new employment with an annual salary of approximately \$92,000 per year. By early 2016, he owed \$70,948 in spousal maintenance. The parties continued to contest numerous issues, and in 2016 wife brought two appeals to this court, which were consolidated.

In September 2017, this court released *Gomes v. Meyer*, Nos. A16-1015, A16-1612, 2017 WL 3863822 (Minn. App. Sept. 5, 2017), addressing eight child-support and spousal-maintenance issues. On the matter of accrued interest, we concluded that the CSM "had

. . . statutory authority to rule on [wife’s] motion to apply Georgia law on the accrual of interest to spousal-maintenance arrears.” 2017 WL 3863822, at *13. We remanded for the CSM to rule on “whether Georgia law on accrual of interest to spousal maintenance applies to the enforcement of the Georgia spousal-maintenance order in Minnesota.” *Id.*¹

On remand, the CSM conducted a hearing in which both parents and the county participated. The CSM determined that Minn. Stat. § 518C.604 (2016) governs the issue of interest accrual, and “generally states that it is the law of the issuing state to compute arrearages and the accrual of interest on the arrearages.” Because “[t]he state of Georgia is the issuing state of [husband’s] spousal maintenance obligation,” the CSM directed the county to “calculate and enforce [husband’s] spousal maintenance obligation including accrued interest based on Georgia substantive law.” Husband appeals.

D E C I S I O N

Husband argues that the CSM erred by ruling that Georgia law governs the calculation of interest on spousal-maintenance arrears. We review de novo questions of law regarding spousal maintenance. *Maiers v. Maiers*, 775 N.W.2d 666, 668 (Minn. App. 2009).

Minnesota law provides that “the computation and payment of arrearages and accrual of interest on the arrearages under [a] support order” are governed by “the law of the issuing state.” Minn. Stat. § 518C.604(a)(2). Husband does not dispute that a Georgia court issued the order setting his spousal-maintenance obligation. Accordingly, under

¹ We also remanded the issue whether mother is voluntarily underemployed. The CSM determined she is not. Husband does not challenge that determination in this appeal.

Minnesota's choice-of-law provision, Georgia law controls the accrual of interest on husband's spousal-maintenance arrears. Title 7 of the Georgia Code provides:

All awards, court orders, decrees, or judgments rendered pursuant to Title 19 expressed in monetary amounts shall accrue interest at the rate of 7 percent per annum commencing 30 days from the date such award, court order, decree, or judgment is entered or an installment payment is due, as applicable.

Ga. Code Ann. § 7-4-12.1 (Supp. 2018). The CSM did not err by directing the county to calculate the interest on husband's spousal-maintenance arrears under Georgia law.

Husband raises several additional arguments, ranging from the amount of his arrears to whether the CSM should waive interest altogether. Husband cites no controlling legal authority with respect to most of these arguments, and we could deem them forfeited for that reason. *State v. Bursch*, 905 N.W.2d 884, 889 (Minn. App. 2017). More importantly, the arguments exceed the scope of this court's remand. On remand, a district court must follow the appellate court's "mandate strictly according to its terms," and has no authority to "alter, amend, or modify" the mandate. *Rooney v. Rooney*, 669 N.W.2d 362, 371 (Minn. App. 2003) (quotation omitted), *review denied* (Minn. Nov. 25, 2003). The CSM properly limited his focus to the two issues on which we remanded, including whether Georgia law controls the accrual of interest on spousal-maintenance arrears. We therefore decline to address husband's additional arguments and affirm the CSM's order directing the county to calculate the interest on husband's spousal-maintenance arrears under Georgia law.

Affirmed.