FILED
MAR 26 1985
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF VIRGINIA L. and ROBERT B. HALE

VIRGINIA L. HALE,
Petitioner-Appellee,

vs.

ROBERT E. HALE,
Respondent-Appellant.

Filed March 26, 1985

5-47
84-797

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Linn County - Paul J. Kilburg, Judge.

Respondent appeals the economic provisions of the dissolution decree. AFFIRMED.

Brian Gruhn, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for respondent-appellant.

T. Todd Becker of the Tom Riley Law Firm, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, for petitioner-appellee.

Considered by Donielson, P.J., Snell, and Schlegel, JJ.

SCHLEGEL, J.

Respondent, Robert Hale, appeals the economic provisions of the dissolution decree. We affirm.

Robert and the petitioner, Virginia Hale, were married in 1974. Robert was forty-three years old, and Virginia was forty-six. Robert brought $13,000 worth of assets into the marriage. Virginia brought $60,000 worth of assets into the marriage. Each party contributed $5,000 toward the purchase of a marital home.

The parties' marriage was dissolved in 1984. Under the property division the premarital assets were awarded to the party who contributed them. The marital assets were divided equally. In addition, Robert was ordered to pay alimony until Virginia reached the age of 65, a period of approximately nine years. He appeals both the division of property and the alimony award.

Our review in this equity case is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. Although we are not bound by the trial court's findings of fact, we give weight to them. Iowa R. App. P. 14(f)(7). The applicable statute is Iowa Code section 598.21 (1983). Our overall goal in reviewing the property division is to see that equity is done. See Iowa Code § 598.21(1).

We cannot agree with Robert that the trial court should have awarded him a share of the assets Virginia brought into the marriage. The only justification Robert offers for dividing Virginia's premarital assets is that Virginia's award of $91,300 is substantially greater than his award of $31,200. We do not find that such a disparity, by itself, shows that the award was inequitable, especially when Virginia had substantially more assets than Robert at the time they married.

We also find no merit in Robert's argument that no alimony should have been awarded. His annual salary is greater than $44,000. Virginia, however, is unemployed and suffering from arthritis that hampers her ability to work. Her alimony award of $75 per week, when combined with her projected interest income, would total less than $9,000 per year. We cannot say that the alimony award was unwarranted or excessive. The provisions of the decree are affirmed.

AFFIRMED.