## COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Chief Judge Moon, Judges Coleman and Bray Argued at Norfolk, Virginia

MARY ELLEN GUILFOYLE v. Record No. 0118-96-1 JOSEPH CHARLES GUILFOYLE MEMORANDUM OPINION<sup>\*</sup> BY JUDGE RICHARD S. BRAY JULY 9, 1996

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF THE CITY OF VIRGINIA BEACH Jerome B. Friedman, Judge

J. Russell Fentress, IV (Goss, Meier & Fentress, on brief), for appellant.

No brief or argument for appellee.

Acting on remand from this Court, the trial court awarded Mary E. Guilfoyle (wife) spousal support of \$2,300 per month from Joseph C. Guilfoyle (husband) and ordered husband to pay \$4,000 of wife's attorney's fees. On appeal, wife complains that these awards are inadequate. We disagree and affirm the decision of the trial court.

The parties are fully conversant with the record, and a recitation of the facts is unnecessary to this appeal. Under well established principles, a trial court is vested with broad discretion in awarding both spousal support, <u>see Papuchis v.</u> <u>Papuchis</u>, 2 Va. App. 130, 133, 341 S.E.2d 829, 831 (1986), and attorney's fees, <u>see Graves v. Graves</u>, 4 Va. App. 326, 333, 357 S.E.2d 554, 558 (1987), and we review such decrees only for an

 $<sup>^{*} \</sup>mbox{Pursuant}$  to Code § 17-116.010 this opinion is not designated for publication.

abuse of discretion. <u>See Graves</u>, 4 Va. App. at 333, 357 S.E.2d at 558; <u>Papuchis</u>, 2 Va. App. at 133, 341 S.E.2d at 831.

Here, we find that the trial court properly considered the appropriate statutory imperatives in fixing the disputed spousal support and did not abuse its discretion in awarding such support or the related attorney's fees. Accordingly, we affirm the decree.

## Affirmed.