

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

EUGENE DEVERE GREEN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

EDELTRAUT RIST GREEN,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

February 4, 2000

No. 215736

Wexford Circuit Court

LC No. 98-013784-DO

Before: O’Connell, P.J., and Meter and T. G. Hicks\*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right from the judgment of divorce entered after a bench trial. We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

In reviewing a dispositional ruling in a divorce case, this Court will first review the trial court’s findings of fact for clear error and then determine whether the dispositional ruling was fair and equitable in light of the facts. *Sands v Sands*, 442 Mich 30, 34; 497 NW2d 493 (1993). Property disposition rulings will be affirmed unless we are left with the firm conviction that the distribution was inequitable. *Id.*

Defendant asserts that the trial court erred in its findings regarding credit card debt and the assignment of a land contract. However, the trial court awarded defendant the \$300 credit toward the debt that was requested by defendant’s counsel in closing argument. There is no basis for finding factual error where defendant received exactly the credit she requested. See *People v Griffin*, 235 Mich App 27, 45-46; 597 NW2d 176 (1999) (“[E]rror requiring reversal cannot be error to which the aggrieved party contributed by plan or negligence . . .”). Additionally, defendant did not show that the trial court erred in failing to award the land contract as individual property. The land contract preceded the divorce filing and was apparently in both parties’ names. Defendant failed to establish that the court erred in treating the contract as marital property and in failing to award the contract to her.

---

\* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

Defendant asserts that the distribution of property was inequitable. Plaintiff was awarded the property he owned prior to the marriage, *Reeves v Reeves*, 226 Mich App 490, 493-494; 575

NW2d 1 (1997), and defendant was awarded the profit earned on the home bought after the marriage. The distribution of the remaining property was substantially equal. Given the circumstances of both parties, there is no showing that the property distribution was inequitable.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell

/s/ Patrick M. Meter

/s/ Timothy G. Hicks