

[Cite as *Parker v. Kohl-Parker*, 2007-Ohio-5877.]

[Please see original opinion at 2007-Ohio-4895.]

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

JACK H. PARKER, JR. :
Plaintiff-Appellant : C.A. CASE NO. 21760
v. : T.C. NO. 04 DR 749
SUSANNE KOHL-PARKER : (Civil Appeal from Common
Defendant-Appellee : Pleas Court Domestic Relations)
:
:
.....

DECISION AND FINAL JUDGMENT ENTRY

Rendered on the 2nd day of November, 2007.

.....

JACK H. PARKER, JR., 10030 Simms Station Road, Dayton, Ohio 45458
Plaintiff-Appellant

RICHARD HEMPFLING, Atty. Reg. No. 0029986, 318 West Fourth Street, Dayton, Ohio
45402
Attorney for Defendant-Appellee

.....

DONOVAN, J.

{¶ 1} This matter is before the Court on the Application for Reconsideration of Susanne Kohl-Parker, filed October 1, 2007. On October 3, 2007, Jack Parker opposed Susanne’s Application. On September 21, 2007, we issued a decision reversing in part the judgment of the domestic relations court, finding that the court abused its discretion in failing to

provide for the termination of Susanne Kohl-Parker's spousal support award.

{¶ 2} When reviewing a motion for reconsideration, the test, generally, is whether the motion alerts the court to an obvious error in its decision or raises an issue that was either not considered or not fully considered by the court. *City of Columbus v. Hodge* (1987), 37 Ohio App.3d 68. Having reviewed Susanne's Application, we find that it is well taken; an error occurred in this court's judgment of September 21, 2007, in that the term of spousal support did contain a definitive end date of thirty months. Pursuant to R.C. 3105.18, the domestic relations court considered all the necessary factors in determining a spousal support award for Susanne that is appropriate and reasonable in terms of amount and duration. See *Williams-Booker v. Booker*, Montgomery App. Nos. 21752, 21767, 2007-Ohio-4717 (affirming thirty-two month spousal support award following nine year marriage). There being no abuse of discretion, and since reconsideration is accordingly warranted, Susanne's Application is granted. The Final Judgment and Decree of Divorce, filed July 27, 2006 is affirmed. We note in conclusion that all other assignments of error are not effected by the correction of our judgment on the seventh assignment of error.

SO ORDERED.

JAMES A. BROGAN, Judge

THOMAS J. GRADY, Judge

MARY E. DONOVAN, Judge

Copies mailed to:

Jack H. Parker, Jr.
Richard Hempfling
Hon. Denise L. Cross