FILED
JUN 30 1978
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF LOIS M. SCHILLING AND RICHARD P. SCHILLING

Upon the Petition of)
LOIS M. SCHILLING,) Filed June 30, 1978
Appellee,)
And Concerning)
RICHARD P. SCHILLING,) 559 / 2-61088
Appellant.)

Appeal from Linn District Court - Ansel J. Chapman, Judge.

Appeal by husband from the property settlement provisions of a dissolution of marriage decree. - Affirmed.

John C. Platt, Cedar Rapids, for Appellant.

William J. Matias, Cedar Rapids, for Appellee.

Submitted to Allbee, C.J., and Donielson, Snell, Oxberger and Carter, JJ.

PER CURIAM

Respondent Richard Schilling appeals the property settlement provisions of the dissolution decree. Specifically, Richard appeals the provisions of the decree awarding petitioner Lois Schilling an interest as a tenant in common with respondent in their vendees' interest in real property located in Benton County, Iowa. Richard also appeals the portion of the decree awarding Lois the sum of $5300 which was entered as a judgment against respondent and as a lien against his home as a partial property settlement. Our review is de novo. Rule 4, Rules of Appellate Procedure. See also In re Marriage of Winegard, 257 N.W.2d 609, 613 (Iowa 1977).

The criteria for reviewing property settlement awards is contained in Schantz v. Schantz, 163 N.W.2d 398, 405 (Iowa 1968) as modified by In re Marriage of Williams, 199 N.W.2d 339, 345-6 (Iowa 1972). Precedents are of little value in determining what is a fair division of assets between the parties to a dissolved marriage. In re Marriage of Kehrli, 241 N.W.2d 923, 926 (Iowa 1976). Each case is dependent upon its own facts. In re Marriage of Romig, 207 N.W.2d 780, 783 (Iowa 1973). While we give weight to the trial court's findings of fact, we are not bound by them. Rule 14(f)(7), R. App. P.; Winegard, supra.

Our de novo review of the evidence and application of the Schantz criteria leads us to the same result reached by the trial court. The record discloses that both parties brought approximately the same amount of assets into the marriage. Although the marriage was relatively short, lasting almost five years, both parties worked throughout the marriage and the assets they accumulated resulted from their joint efforts. Finally, in dividing the assets, the trial court took into account the funds petitioner withdrew from their joint bank account and savings bonds she took at the time of their separation. The property settlement is equitable, the trial court did not err and the decree is affirmed.