FILED
APR 27 1982
CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF RAE JEAN SWEENEY AND DANIEL A. SWEENEY

UPON THE PETITION OF RAE JEAN SWEENEY,	)	228
	)	Filed April 27, 1982
Petitioner-Appellee,	)	2-95
AND CONCERNING DANIEL A. SWEENEY,	)	2-66652
Respondent-Appellant.	)	

Appeal from Linn District Court, Larry J. Conmey, Judge.

Respondent-husband appeals from the economic provisions of the parties' dissolution decree, asserting that the child support award is excessive and inequitable. AFFIRMED.

James J. Chipolas of Chipolas, Platt, Maher & Forte, Cedar Rapids, for respondent-appellant.

Kathleen H. Chapman of Dumbaugh, Booth, Gross & Chapman, Cedar Rapids, for petitioner-appellee.

Considered by Oxberger, C.J., Carter and Johnson, JJ.

Respondent-husband appeals from the economic provisions of the parties' dissolution decree, asserting that the child support award is excessive and inequitable. We affirm.

The petitioner-wife's gross monthly income is $775.32, and the respondent husband's gross monthly income is $2348. The respondent was ordered by the trial court to pay child support of $150 per week for the three children ages sixteen, thirteen, and twelve. The award is to be reduced to $125 and $75 as the children become ineligible for support. In addition, respondent must pay for the children's medical and dental insurance and any expenses not covered by insurance and for $100 per year for each child's clothing and school supplies expenses.

The principles guiding child support awards are set out in section 598.21, The Code. Under these guidelines, the earning capacity of each party is an important consideration. In this particular case, respondent's gross income is approximately three times petitioner's gross income. She is a clerk-typist and he is a department supervisor.

Respondent has chosen to live in an exclusive apartment which rents for $350 per month and has taken several vacation trips to Canada. His employer pays his insurance coverage although there is a limit on the coverage of dental expenses. Petitioner must pay her own insurance premiums, although she does have her policy through her employer. Petitioner pays for the mortgage, taxes and insurance on the parties' home, and she is responsible for its upkeep. Respondent has a relatively new car and has his car payments deducted automatically from his paycheck, which at first glance makes his net pay seem smaller than it really is. Petitioner stated that the older model car she drives will need to be replaced soon.

Given the difference in the parties' incomes and the expenses for which each is and will be responsible, we see no inequity in the child support award the trial court designed.

AFFIRMED.