

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO FILE REHEARING  
MOTION AND, IF FILED, DETERMINED

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL  
OF FLORIDA  
SECOND DISTRICT

CARRIE L. BUCK,	)	
	)	
Appellant,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 2D19-2824
	)	
KERRY D. BUCK,	)	
	)	
Appellee.	)	
_____	)	

Opinion filed November 20, 2020.

Appeal from the Circuit Court for Hillsborough County; Darren A. Farfante, Judge.

Mark F. Baseman of Felix, Felix & Baseman, Tampa, for Appellant.

Duane A. Daiker of Shumaker, Loop & Kendrick, LLP, Tampa, for Appellee.

LUCAS, Judge.

Carrie L. Buck (the Former Wife) appeals the "Amended Final Judgment on Former Husband's Supplemental Petition for Modification of Alimony and Child Support" entered on July 3, 2019. We find no merit in the Former Wife's arguments and affirm the judgment below in all respects save one. The amended final judgment included findings as to the parties' respective gross and net incomes, as well as deductions to those incomes, from which the court computed a modified child support

obligation for Kerry Buck (the Former Husband). But as the Former Wife points out, it is impossible to determine from the record how the court arrived at the income figures or deductions it utilized, or what calculations it used to reach those figures. Without competent, substantial evidence to support the court's income findings, we are compelled to reverse the court's judgment with respect to those calculations. See C.J.I.-R. v. C.M., 215 So. 3d 198, 198 (Fla. 2d DCA 2017) (citing Hoffman v. Hoffman, 98 So. 3d 196, 197 (Fla. 2d DCA 2012); McCants v. McCants, 984 So. 2d 678, 682 (Fla. 2d DCA 2008)).<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we reverse the judgment below, but only as to the court's child support calculations, and remand with directions for the court to recalculate the parties' respective incomes based upon the record evidence. We affirm the judgment in all other respects.

Affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded with instructions.

KHOUZAM, C.J., and STARGEL, J., Concur.

---

<sup>1</sup>The Former Husband posits some possible mathematical calculations the circuit court may have used, which, he argues, would approximate the income and deductions figures in the amended final judgment. The difficulty with accepting the Former Husband's argument is that it would be completely speculative on our part to assume that the circuit court contemplated any of his proffered calculations when none of them were ever discussed, much less accepted. See Butler v. Yusem, 44 So. 3d 102, 105 (Fla. 2010) ("Under the tipsy coachman doctrine, where the trial court 'reaches the right result, but for the wrong reasons,' an appellate court can affirm the decision only if 'there is any theory or principle of law *in the record* which would support the ruling.'" (quoting Robertson v. State, 829 So. 2d 901, 906 (Fla. 2002))).