



his home with his family. However, Shierling did not present any evidence or argument that would support a finding that the denial of his motion constituted an abuse of discretion. See Simonik v. Patterson, 752 So. 2d 692, 692-93 (Fla. 3d DCA 2000). Accordingly, we affirm. We note that this affirmance does not preclude Shierling from moving to modify the injunction in the future should he be able to present evidence that warrants modification.

Affirmed.

ALTENBERND and BLACK, JJ., Concur.