

FILED

DEC 27 1983

CLERK SUPREME COURT

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA**IN RE THE MARRIAGE OF PHYLIP WATSON AND LUCILLE WATSON**UPON THE PETITION OF
PHYLIP WATSON,

)

Filed December 27, 1983

Petitioner-Appellee,

)

)

AND CONCERNING
LUCILLE WATSON,

)

3-397
83-470

Respondent-Appellant.

)

Appeal from Polk District Court, Richard A. Strickler, Judge.

Respondent-wife appeals from economic provisions of the parties' dissolution
decree. **AFFIRMED.**Robert R. Rydell of Tesdell, Rydell, Hall & Shinkle, Des Moines, for
respondent-appellant.James P. Irish of Skinner, Beattie & Wilson, Des Moines, for petitioner-
appellee.

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

OXBERGER, C.J.

Respondent-wife appeals from economic provisions of the parties' dissolution decree, asserting that both the alimony award and property division were inequitable. Respondent-wife has also requested attorney fees on appeal. We affirm.

Our review of this equitable proceeding is de novo. In re Marriage of Castle, 312 N.W.2d 147, 148 (Iowa Ct. App. 1981). We review the facts as well as the law and determine rights anew from the credible evidence on properly presented and preserved issues. In re Marriage of Full, 255 N.W.2d 153, 158 (Iowa 1977). While we give weight to the findings of the trial court, especially where the credibility of witnesses is involved, we are not bound by them. Iowa R. App. P. 14(f)(7).

We have reviewed the record and are not convinced that the economic provisions were inequitable. Lucille was awarded a home, a car, one-half interest in some Florida property, and a \$300-a-month alimony award. Even though Phylip was awarded a newer vehicle and several properties that the two had accumulated, he was also ordered to assume all debts. Lucille was left free from all personal debt and exempt from any indebtedness due on the home. She also received all the appliances, furniture, and silver belonging to the parties. Furthermore, Phylip was ordered to maintain fire and peril insurance on Lucille's home and required to pay \$1300 for Lucille's attorneys fees. As such, we see no error in the trial court's judgment.

Lucille requests attorney fees for services rendered on appeal. She is not entitled to those fees as a matter of right. In re Marriage of Erickson, 228 N.W.2d 57, 59 (Iowa 1975).

AFFIRMED.