



**Fourth Court of Appeals**  
**San Antonio, Texas**

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

No. 04-21-00165-CV

**IN THE MATTER OF THE MARRIAGE OF**  
**Geraldine SCANTLAND and Trevor Scantland**

**AND IN THE INTEREST OF**  
**X.S., X.S., AND X.S., Children**

From the 408th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas  
Trial Court No. 2019-CI-15931<sup>1</sup>  
Honorable Laura Salinas, Judge Presiding

Opinion by: Liza A. Rodriguez, Justice

Sitting: Rebeca C. Martinez, Chief Justice  
Patricia O. Alvarez, Justice  
Liza A. Rodriguez, Justice

Delivered and Filed: June 15, 2022

**AFFIRMED**

Appellant Geraldine Scantland, proceeding pro se, appeals the trial court's judgment signed on March 30, 2021 granting a final divorce between Geraldine and Trevor Scantland and determining conservatorship of their three children X.S., X.S., and X.S. We affirm the trial court's judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup>The clerk's record reflects that Trial Court Cause No. 2015-EM-507659, *In the Interest of X.S., X.S., and X.S., Children*, pending in the 408th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas was consolidated into Trial Court Cause No. 2019-CI-15931, *In the Matter of the Marriage of Geraldine and Trevor Scantland*, in the 408th Judicial District Court, Bexar County, Texas upon the motion of the Office of the Attorney General for the State of Texas, as Intervenor. See TEX. FAM. CODE ANN. Ch. 231.

## BACKGROUND

On August 8, 2019, Geraldine Scantland filed a pro se petition for divorce seeking sole managing conservatorship of the children. Trevor Scantland responded by filing a countersuit for divorce on September 29, 2020 in which he sought joint conservatorship of the children. The trial court entered temporary orders on December 9, 2020 appointing Geraldine as temporary sole managing conservator of the children and appointing Trevor as temporary possessory conservator with supervised visitation twice every week for two hours at KidShare.

A bench hearing on the divorce petitions was held on February 25, 2021. Geraldine and Trevor provided testimony establishing that they were married on July 4, 2009, separated on October 4, 2017, and had three male children together who were eleven, eight, and three years old at the time of the hearing. Both requested entry of a final divorce decree. The parties stated there was no property to be divided between them and the sole contested issue was conservatorship of the children. At the hearing, Geraldine requested that she be appointed sole managing conservator and Trevor requested that he be appointed possessory conservator and awarded standard visitation. On March 30, 2021, the trial court signed a final divorce decree appointing Geraldine as sole managing conservator and Trevor as possessory conservator with supervised visitation once every week for two hours at KidShare. Trevor was also ordered to pay child support. In addition, the parties were ordered to communicate only through Appclose and to refrain from posting any pictures or videos of the children on social media. Geraldine was ordered to have no contact with Trevor's girlfriend, Ebony Kelly, and Kelly was prohibited from being present during any possession periods. Finally, the trial court entered a permanent injunction against Trevor enjoining him from coming within 100 feet of Geraldine's residence or place of employment for any purpose other than the exercise of possession. Geraldine appealed.

## DISCUSSION

Geraldine raises five issues in her pro se brief, which we liberally construe.<sup>2</sup> See TEX. R. APP. P. 38.9. As her main complaint raised in three issues, Geraldine asserts the trial court acted against the children’s best interest by granting Trevor possessory conservatorship. Geraldine argues the trial court’s judgment shows it failed to consider the “history of Family Domestic Violence,” “abusive factors,” and “abandonment,” and “ignored the emotional and physical well-being of the children.” We review a trial court’s decisions pertaining to conservatorship, possession and access, and child support, for an abuse of discretion. *In re T.K.D.-H.*, 439 S.W.3d 473, 481 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2014, no pet.). The trial court abuses its discretion by awarding relief not supported by the pleadings or by rendering a decision without sufficient supporting evidence. *Id.*

In her brief, Geraldine quotes a statement she addressed to the trial court at the beginning of the hearing that, “as far as the kids are concerned, the threats on their behalf, the domestic violence, the emotional trauma that it’s [sic] caused for all of us is a huge concern.” Geraldine represented herself at the hearing and this statement was made before she was sworn in as a witness. During her sworn testimony, Geraldine did not testify about a history of domestic violence or any specific threats made by Trevor against the children. The only testimony Geraldine provided about a specific incident was that Trevor had called her about his girlfriend’s complaints and “said he was going to come over, show an example . . . [h]e just continues to lash out” and he then cancelled subsequent visits. During Trevor’s testimony, no evidence was presented about domestic violence. Despite the scarcity of evidence of domestic violence in the record before us, the fact that the trial court restricted Trevor’s visitation to two-hour weekly visits under supervision

---

<sup>2</sup>Trevor did not file an appellee’s brief and the Attorney General’s Office filed a letter stating it would not file a brief as Intervenor.

at KidShare and entered a permanent injunction requiring Trevor to stay 100 feet away from the residence shows the court was aware of the domestic violence problem in the family. In her brief, beyond the general references to domestic violence and threats, Geraldine makes no argument to show why the trial court abused its discretion by awarding Trevor possessory conservatorship and restricting his visitation and access to the residence. With respect to abandonment, the trial court made clear on the record that there was no abandonment issue in this case. We therefore overrule Geraldine's issues regarding conservatorship.<sup>3</sup>

In a separate issue, Geraldine asserts there was factually sufficient evidence to support a finding of bigamy against Trevor. However, when Geraldine referenced bigamy during the hearing, the trial court made clear on the record that bigamy is a criminal offense and as such was not at issue in the divorce proceeding. We overrule Geraldine's issue arguing the trial court erred by failing to make a finding of bigamy.

Finally, Geraldine asserts the trial court's joinder of the two cases caused a delay in the court's ruling. However, the record does not reflect an objection by Geraldine which was necessary to preserve any error. *See* TEX. R. APP. P. 33.1(a). Further, even if the issue was preserved for review, Geraldine makes no argument explaining how the joinder caused a delay and how any such delay was harmful.

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing reasons, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

Liza A. Rodriguez, Justice

---

<sup>3</sup>In her brief, Geraldine states, "the courts do not have all the information that was needed" and suggests more testimony could have been provided if she had not been "under distress harassment and threats of violence throughout court proceeding notated on record." Our review as an appellate court is restricted to the record before us, and there is nothing in this record to show that Geraldine brought any such threats or harassment to the attention of the trial court or otherwise made a record that we can review.