

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE MARRIAGE OF JULIE MARIE CHAMBERS AND DOUGLAS OREN CHAMBERS

Upon the Petition of	)	36
JULIE MARIE CHAMBERS,	)	
Petitioner-Appellee,	)	Filed June 25, 1985
And Concerning	)	
DOUGLAS OREN CHAMBERS,	)	<u>5-177</u>
Respondent-Appellant.	)	<u>84-1252</u>

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Warren County - Ray Hanrahan,
Judge.

Respondent appeals the child custody and visitation provisions of his
dissolution decree. AFFIRMED.

Jeffrey G. Flagg of Flagg, Hockett, Benhart & Jennett, Des Moines, Iowa,
for respondent-appellant.

Claire B. Patin of Elgin, Hoyman, Clogg & Patin, Indianola, Iowa, for
petitioner-appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., Donielson, and Schlegel, JJ.

Respondent, Doug Chambers, appeals the child custody and visitation provisions of his dissolution decree. We affirm.

Doug and the petitioner, Julie Chambers, were married in 1979. They had two children. At the time of trial Doug was 22 years old and Julie was 20 years old. Julie lives in Arkansas. Doug remains in Iowa.

Our review in this equity proceeding is de novo. Iowa R. App. P. 4. We give weight to the findings of the trial court, but are not bound by them. Iowa R. App. P. 14(f)(7).

I. Child Custody. Doug appeals the trial court's decision to award custody of the children to Julie. We have examined the record. It is true, as the trial court found, that Doug would be a suitable person to have custody of the children. However, we agree with and give weight to the trial court's finding that Julie is better suited to have custody of the children.

II. Visitation. Courts, insofar as is reasonable, and where appropriate, are to allow liberal visitation rights, which will assure the child the opportunity for the maximum continuing physical and emotional contact with both parents after dissolution. See Iowa Code § 598.41(1) (1985). The trial court in this case awarded Doug the following visitation rights:

- (a) For a week in March, to coincide with the time of the school spring break which is usually during Easter week.
- (b) For a period of two weeks in the summer.
- (c) For a period of three days during Thanksgiving week on days when the children are not in school.
- (d) For a period of one week during school Christmas vacation.

Considering the distance between Doug and the children in Arkansas, and Doug's and Julie's financial circumstances, we conclude that the visitation provision provides for the maximum amount of visitation practical.

AFFIRMED.