

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Loretta Cunningham nka Loretta Askamit,	)	MEMORANDUM DECISION	
	)	(Not For Official Publication)	
	)		
Petitioner and Appellee,	)	Case No. 20050916-CA	
	)		
v.	)	F I L E D	
	)	(January 12, 2006)	
	)		
Richard C. Cunningham,	)	<table border="1"><tr><td>2006 UT App 14</td></tr></table>	2006 UT App 14
2006 UT App 14			
	)		
Respondent and Appellant.	)		

-----

Second District, Farmington Department, 870741965  
The Honorable Jon M. Memmott

Attorneys: Richard C. Cunningham, Las Cruces, New Mexico,  
Appellant Pro Se

-----

Before Judges Davis, McHugh, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

Richard C. Cunningham appeals the trial court's order awarding Loretta Askamit a portion of his military retirement benefits. This is before the court on its own motion for summary disposition based on the absence of a substantial question for review on appeal.

Cunningham's docketing statement and response to the summary disposition motion fail to identify a specific legal issue for review. Although Cunningham asserts financial hardship, questionable attorney competence, and misconduct by Askamit as reasons why he should not have to share his retirement benefits, these matters have no relevancy on appeal because Cunningham does not assert trial court error in its factual findings or legal conclusions. It is clear that he does not agree with the outcome in the trial court. However, he does not specify a legal issue for review, and disagreement is not a ground for appeal. Because Cunningham states no legal issue for review on appeal, there is

no substantial issue for review warranting further consideration by this court. See Utah R. App. P. 10(e).

Accordingly, the trial court's order is affirmed.

---

James Z. Davis, Judge

---

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

---

Gregory K. Orme, Judge